


# THE GREAT WAR

## SIX SERMONS

===== BY =====  
WASHINGTON GLADDEN

What the War Must Bring  
The Futility of Force  
Is Christianity a Failure?  
What Will End the War?  
Get a New Idea  
The Church and Peace





# THE GREAT WAR

---

## SIX SERMONS

by

Washington Gladden

---

What the War Must Bring  
The Futility of Force  
Is Christianity a Failure?  
What Will End the War?  
Get a New Idea  
The Church and Peace

---

McCLELLAND AND COMPANY  
COLUMBUS, O.

D524  
G45

01

These sermons were preached in the First Congregational Church, Columbus, Ohio, each on the date appended to it. The phases of feeling of the days on which they were spoken may be reflected in them. If some things are said more than once it is to be hoped that they may prove to be things which need reiteration. They are the utterance of a strong faith in the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and of a great hope that this war may help the nations and the churches to see that it is true.

W. G.

Columbus, Ohio, Jan. 10, 1915.



# What The War Must Bring

---

*For the body is not one member, but many. . . . And whether one member suffereth, all the members suffer with it; or one member is honored, all the members rejoice with it—I COR. XII:14, 26.*

Paul's primary reference is to the Christian society, the church, the body of which Jesus Christ is the head. But the law of solidarity which he lays down is of universal application. Man is a social animal, and this is the law to which all his associations are adjusted. The body of humanity is not one member, but many. We are so inter-related that the welfare of each is the concern of all. Human life can only be lived in organic relations in which gains and losses, pains and pleasures, joys and sorrows are shared; in which, if one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; and if one member be honored all the members rejoice with it. This is not because of any social contract in which, as Jean Jacques figured it, we have got together and agreed that it should be so, but because we are so made that it must be so; we cannot live peaceably or prosperously on any other basis. We have the power, indeed, to ignore and disobey the law, but that is only the power to bring loss and misery and defeat upon ourselves. We are members one of another; that is the biological fact; and as all the members of the body co-operate for the welfare of the body, and as each finds its own health and strength in the common life to which it contributes, so do we, in all our social relations, seek the good of life by multiplying and sharing the things we have in common. It is possible, of course, for the feet to batter and bruise each other, and for the hands to claw the cheeks, and for the teeth to bite the tongue, but that kind of insanity is not prevalent; nobody thinks that anything is to be gained by strife among the members of the body. Each one of us is a walking illustration of the law of social co-operation.

The principle of solidarity reveals itself in concentric and enlarging circles of human relationship. It begins, of course, in the family, which is the primary social unit. Every normal household rests upon the principle of mutuality. The family good is a common good; each contributes to it what he can and receives from it what he needs. The children begin by receiving much and giving little, but they end, if the family holds together as it should, by giving much and receiving little. The problem is to divide and apportion ability and need so that each shall have the consciousness of giving what he can to the common good, and of receiving from it what he needs. No member of the family, grandparent, parent, husband, wife, son or daughter, brother or sister, ever dreams of levying tribute for his own

benefit on the contributions of the others and increasing his share by lessening theirs; and no one has any doubt but that his interests will always be considered and his wants provided for, if there is enough in the common store to meet his need. This is the law of the normal household; and it gives us the principle which is intended to govern all associations of human beings with one another. We could not conceive in a normal family, of some members robed in silk and feasting on luxuries, while others were clad in rags and munching crusts. If riches are there all have them; if poverty arrives the burden is borne by all. Sickness cannot come into the home without laying its load of solicitude and fear on the hearts of all its inmates. If one member suffer all the members suffer with it.

As we go out from the home to the larger circles of relationship the ties that bind are, of course, much loosened and the sense of solidarity becomes fainter. Yet even in the primitive communities there is a real consciousness of unity, and a strong feeling of interdependence. The typical country school district in which some of us once lived, was made up of people whose individualism was strongly developed; nevertheless, there was much conscious community of interest among these isolated neighbors. They exchanged work in hoeing and haying and harvesting and logging; a barn-raising was a social festival; butchering-time opened the door to the sharing of edibles; and serious sickness or death brought the whole neighborhood into close sympathy. Especially when the common epidemics prevailed we were made aware of our common heritage of suffering; somehow the measles and the mumps found their way from house to house through those scattered populations.

The people came to feel more or less keenly that they were members one of another and that the fortune or misfortune of each was the concern of all. There is still much to be desired in the strengthening of that social bond in the rural communities—much that the rural church ought to do, and often sadly fails to do, because it is a house divided against itself, and by its senseless and wicked divisions has unfitted itself for the unifying work in which it ought to be the leader.

When we rise to the great municipalities, the consciousness of solidarity is sometimes present; you can think of cities in which it is a powerful influence. We could wish that there were more of it in most of our cities. We could wish that in our own city and in every American city, there might be more of the feeling that found utterance on the lips of so many of the Hebrew singers when they poured out their hearts in passionate praise of Jerusalem; rejoicing in its strength and beauty, praying for its peace, calling down the blessings of heaven on all who loved it and sought its prosperity. I can think of no good reason why the city where he lives should not be as dear to the heart of every good citizen, as Jerusalem was to the psalmists of the olden time.

But the solidarity of the modern city is not so much a sentiment as a practical everyday reality. We do not feel our



unity so deeply as well we might, but our interdependence is the working principle of our existence. A very large share of the good of life, in a city like this, is a common good. The streets and the parks and the levees and the street lights and the waterworks and the public buildings and the schools are all common property, the provisions for transportation and for heating are under our common control; in all this vast system of ownership and operation we are business partners, and the government of our city in all its phases is largely a business enterprise in which we are co-operators. That is what democracy means—many members in one body.

In our economic and industrial interests also, we are greatly dependent on one another. The prosperity of each class promotes the welfare of every other class; when all the mills and factories are running and the wage-workers are employed, trade is brisk, the builders prosper, salaried people find employment; all share in the abundance; but if dearth or misfortune comes to any branch of industry, the injury is felt, more or less, by all the rest.

So of the public health. Each of us is interested that all his fellow citizens should be sound and well; for each able-bodied citizen has the power to make the contribution due from him to the commonwealth; while invalids are liable to be a charge upon the common purse, and contagions spread. Nothing is more democratic than disease; it is no respecter of persons or classes; if diphtheria is entertained in the slums it is quite apt to go calling, without invitation, on the boulevards.

Thus it appears that even in the larger civic groups, we find ourselves inextricably bound together, members of one body, partners in gain and loss, in pleasure and pain, sharers of one another's hopes and fears and joys and sorrows. This is not the result of any deliberate purpose or arrangement of our own, it is the simple consequence of the fact that we are social beings, members of one body.

It is hardly needful to argue that the nation also is an organism, in which all classes are united by the same vital bond; so that no class or group can isolate itself from the rest and try to live at the expense of the rest, or in disregard of the welfare of the rest, without bringing disorder and disaster into the life of the nation. Only when all groups and classes clearly discern and joyfully recognize the bond that unites them to the commonwealth, and study and strive to make the contribution which is due from them to the common life, does the nation dwell in peace and security.

Quite dimly, as yet, does this tremendous truth become visible to the whole people; there are some who see it clearly; to most it appears as in a blurred mirror, darkly; but recent years have been steadily making it more and more manifest, and the day will come when it will be realized that in the nation, as truly as in the family, we are members one of another, and that the life of the nation must be so organized that the law of sharing shall govern all our relations to one another.

Having reached this stage in our moral development, it has been commonly assumed that we were at the end of the course. Within the life of the nation, it was admitted, the law of reciprocity ought to rule; beyond the frontiers there was no such obligation. In its intercourse with other nations, each nation would, of course, look out for itself. I remember very well when Lord Palmerston, the English premier, distinctly stated in Parliament, that in the settlement of an international difficulty England would, of course, be governed wholly by what she believed to be for her interest. I have heard eminent authorities in international law lay down the same principle—that nations could recognize no higher law than the law of self-interest. This, of course, makes every nation the natural rival and the presumptive enemy of every other nation, and puts the whole world on a war basis. Every nation feels justified in strengthening its own power, not only in entire disregard of the welfare of other nations, but at their expense. A strong nation may invade, overpower, oppress, enslave a weaker nation, if she can do so without exciting the cupidity of other nations stronger than herself. The ultimate appeal in international relations is the right of the strongest.

This has been, practically, the basis on which the affairs of nations have been settled throughout the centuries. Of late, however, it seems to have begun to dawn on the minds of thoughtful people that this is not a good basis of international relationship. A new note has been heard in the councils of the publicists. It has been recognized that there are human obligations and responsibilities that cannot be ignored. Our own government has, on one occasion at least, distinctly announced that the United States proposed to be governed in its relations with other nations by the Golden Rule. Thus it appears that we have witnessed the dawn of the day when it will appear to all men that the law of solidarity governs all human kind; that nations as well as individuals and social classes, are members one of another; that nations and races are bound together by the fact of brotherhood; that the supreme good of humanity is a common good; that no nation can win real and lasting prosperity at the expense of other nations; that it is as true of the whole human family as of the group around the household hearth, that if one member suffers all the members share in the suffering, that if one member is honored all the members share in the honor.

That such is the right relation of the peoples and tribes that dwell on the face of the earth is beginning, I say, to be understood by those who walk in the light of this new day. The past two decades have witnessed a marvelous growth of this sentiment; hundreds of peace organizations have been spreading the truth respecting the true basis of international relationships, and a great multitude of men of good will have been preaching the gospel of peace.

What has brought about this change in the direction of thought? It is due in part, no doubt, to the steadily rising

ethical conceptions of men; to a better understanding of the fundamental truths of the Christian morality. The expectation of a day when all the people of the world shall live in peace and unity is, indeed, one part of the great heritage which has come down to us from the Hebrew prophets; while He who came to fulfill their hopes was proclaimed by an angelic chorus, who sang of Peace on Earth and Good Will to Men. Not always has his church given to this truth the centrality which belongs to it; yet it has never been wholly obscured, and in these last days it has been gaining power over the hearts of men. The great truth of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man has been emerging from the theological fog and murk in which it has so long been hidden, and its implications in the world-order have begun to appear.

But there are other and more palpable reasons why this idea of the solidarity of humanity has been gaining a place in the thoughts of men. In those studies of "the New World-Life"\* which we have been conducting during the present summer, we have seen what tremendous forces have been at work within the last century to change the whole drift of human destiny. We have seen how, almost within the memory of some of us, the main currents of human tendency have been reversed; how it was true, up to a hundred years ago, that all the tendencies were toward the dispersion and isolation of peoples,—to drive them apart and make them strangers and foes to one another; whereas the prevailing tendencies now are bringing them together into neighborhood and acquaintance. The marvelous improvements in transportation and communication have swept aside the barriers that held people apart; "steam," it has been said, "annihilated nine-tenths of distance and electricity the remainder. Isolation is, therefore, becoming impossible, for the world is now a neighborhood." The swift ships flying from one shore to another weave the ties that bind land to land. Commerce is spreading its vast net and gathering into it peoples of every clime and color. The tribes that once would either have fled from each other or would have fallen upon each other with clubs or spears, now traffic with one another in the market places of the world. The volume of these world exchanges, when compared with those of former days is tremendous. "It would require," says Dr. Strong, "a fleet of 300 vessels such as the Greeks and Phoenicians propelled with oars to carry the cargo of a single modern steamer; and it would take from 375,000 to 500,000 camels to transport the wheat which during the busy season passes over any one of our great east and west railways in a single day. . . . It is evident also that the facilities of a world commerce are rapidly increasing. In 1840, the total foreign commerce of the world was less than \$3,000,000,000; now that of the United States alone reaches \$4,000,000,000; while that of Great Britain is now greater than was the combined commerce of all nations in 1850."†

---

\*"Our World," pp. 20, 25.

†"Our World," by Josiah Strong.

So, too, we have developed a world-industry. The people of all the earth are working together, working for one another. Even in my boyhood every family provided by its own industry for most of its own wants; now far the larger part of every family's needs is supplied by other labor—much of it by the labor of men and women on the other side of the world, while the product of the same family's labor may go to the ends of the earth. People all round the world are laboring to supply your larder, to replenish your wardrobe, to furnish your dining room and your bed room; while goods made in Columbus are marketed in Europe and Asia and Africa and Australia and the islands of the sea. We are directly interested in the thrift and prosperity of black people and white people and yellow people and brown people of many lands who cannot speak our language; and they are glad when our crops are good and there is a demand for their products.

So the capital of every country flows out into other countries and seeks investment there. American capitalists, we are told, have spent \$300,000,000 on subsidiary factories in Canada; and have risked no less than a thousand millions in the development of Mexico. It is estimated that Americans have spent \$100,000,000 in planting factories in the Old World. France is said to have loaned \$15,000,000,000 to industries in other nations, and Great Britain nearly as much.

These are only instances of that wonderful development which has been bringing the people of all the earth into neighborhood and intercourse and community of interest. Most of this has taken place during my life-time. I have watched with my own eyes the operation of the movements and forces which have been drawing the nations into this mighty co-operative relationship. I have seen the foundations laid of what must be the federation of the world. There is no idealism about this, no sentimentalism; this is nobody's dream; this is business. And this means, of course, that there must be for this world-industry and world-commerce and world-finance a world-peace; nations which are so vitally linked together must be friends. Each depends for its welfare and prosperity on the welfare and prosperity of all the rest. They are members one of another. Their interests are common. It is just as idiotic for them to make war on one another, as it would be for your own two feet to kick each other, or your two fists to hammer each other or your eyes to blockade your ears, or your chin to try to knock out your nose. And this has been brought about by no treaties or conventions or agreements, but by the silent and resistless operation of social forces resident in human nature. Reverently we may say this is God's work. It is his way of bringing the nations together.

But while the world, by these mighty movements, has been steadily building up this vast community of interests and initiating these great co-operations, other agencies have been at work to check and thwart the great consummation. The tradition of isolation and antagonism dies hard. There are historical resent-

ments and jealousies and suspicions that array the nations against each other. "Nations," says Dr. Strong, "have long looked on each other as necessary rivals, if not as natural enemies. They have sought to live separate lives; they have pursued selfish and, therefore, short-sighted policies; they have plotted and warred to weaken each other; they have set up artificial barriers to commerce; they have erected national instead of universal standards of ethics, and have honored national bigotry as patriotism." It is hard to unlearn these age-long antipathies and egoisms. And I think we must say that national policies, as a rule, have hitherto been guided by these antipathies, rather than by those new and wonderful tendencies to unity and co-operation whose movements we have been tracing. The rulers of the world have been far more intent on the aggrandizement of the separate nationalities than on the common welfare. They have given a greatly exaggerated attention to the things that make for separation and antagonism and much less thought to the things that make for unity. Instead of opening wide the gates to peaceful intercourse with other peoples they have been building forts and fleets and gathering immense armies and armaments for warfare with their neighbors.

All this has been done, of course, in flagrant defiance of that world-wide movement which we have been considering. Not in conscious defiance, perhaps; but surely in stupid or sullen unconsciousness of the existence and the influence of the secular forces which have been welding the nations together. If there had been even a dim recognition of the truth that they are members one of another; that the supreme good of humanity is and must be a common good, no such constant and stupendous preparations for mutual destruction could have been thought of.

Three weeks ago, any philosophic student of world problems would have been entitled, at least, to the hope that the great fact of human solidarity had so far impressed itself upon the mind of the world, that the rulers of the world would have been inclined to respect it and adjust their policies with reference to it. Of course, there were the armaments, and it is hard for people with such tools in their hands to keep from using them; and there were the traditional enmities and grudges and all that is tinder too easily ignited; but here were the great facts of mutual interest, of world-wide inter-relationship and interdependence; new facts in the world's history; shining facts, stupendous facts, the like of which the world had never before confronted. Was it not possible that due weight would be given to these and that the rulers might find some way of composing their differences without resorting to war?

Alas, that hope was too sanguine. It gave too large credit to the intelligence and sagacity of the rulers of the world; it underrated the bigotries and stupidities of kings and councils and chancelleries; it failed to estimate at its full value the strength of the obsession of militarism.

For here are all the great nations of Europe suddenly

plunged into a conflict which bids fair to be the most destructive and disastrous ever waged upon this planet.

And for what? Had either of these warring nations made any actual encroachment upon the rights or liberties of those with whom it is now in deadly grapple? I do not hear of any. Austria charged Servia with murdering her grand duke; but the charge was not proven, and Servia was ready to make all possible reparation. The real reason was Austria's fear that Servia was growing too strong, and her determination to humble her and keep her under. France had made no attack on Germany nor Germany on France, but each has been terribly afraid that the other would become too powerful. Some of these fighting powers have been dragged into the conflict greatly against their wishes and for them we must have sympathy; but the fundamental reason for the war is the mutual jealousy and fear of these nations; their assumption that each is the natural enemy of the other; their determination to seek their own national aggrandizement with no regard for the welfare of the rest.

What are the causes of this war?

First of all, the lust of fighting, the inheritance of the "ape and tiger" which still kennels in human hearts, and now and then breaks out in savagery.

Second, the curse of selfishness which, defying the order of nature, arrays the individual or the group against the commonwealth, and sets the members to devouring one another instead of serving the needs of the body.

Third, the rule of privileged classes, who have become incapable of taking the world-view of national obligations, and insist on the traditions and policies which they have inherited. "We are face to face with a frightful calamity," says a London journal of week before last, "not because the people of Europe desire war, still less because they have a hand in making it, but because kings and emperors, ministers and diplomats, have allowed themselves to think of policies and frontiers rather than of the lives of men and the happiness of women and children. The people of Europe have no quarrel with each other, and no enmity against each other which has not been artificially created and fostered."

Fourth, in the words of the same witness, "the present crisis is the natural consequence of allowing national hatreds to accumulate, and of piling up armaments instead of seeking to remove the causes of misunderstanding between nations, and cultivating the influences which make for peace. War will not remove these misunderstandings, but only intensifies them."

What will be the gain of the war to the warring nations? There will be no gain, absolutely none. I defy any man to suggest any rational probability of advantage to any one of them. Every one of them will be impoverished, crippled, burdened with enormous debts; every one of them will emerge from the war in worse condition than when it entered it. If any one of them should gain such an advantage as to threaten to become a domi-

nant power, that very advantage would prove to be a millstone about her neck, for it would promptly lead to new combinations in which all her defeated rivals and most of her allies would be arrayed against her. That would mean a later struggle in which her yoke would be broken.

What will the war bring to the people of these distracted countries? Alas, it is too easy to tell. It will bring, it must bring, if it continues long, such a deluge of disasters as the sun has never looked down upon. Through all those fertile valleys, miles on miles of trenches filled with dead men,—the young men, the strong men of all these countries—hundreds of thousands of them cut down in the flower of their manhood; homes desolated, widows bearing a life-long sorrow; mothers weeping for their boys who will never return; little children orphaned and hungry and homeless; cripples filling the streets for many a year and eating the bread of charity; industries ruined; workless throngs besieging the gates of closed factories; many a beautiful city and town laid waste, palaces and cottages in ruins, the instruments of industry wrecked and thrown to the junk-pile, the monuments of architecture and treasures of art mutilated or destroyed. From how many pale lips shall the wail of the old prophet be heard: "Upon the land of my people shall come up thorns and briers; yea upon all the houses of joy in the joyous city; for the palace shall be forsaken; the populous city shall be deserted; the hill and the watch tower shall be for dens forever—a joy of wild asses, a pasture of flocks." This is what war means, what it always means: waste, want, destruction, desolation, poverty, misery, sorrow and death—death in its most frightful forms, with its most ghastly circumstances. All this war must always bring, but this war, with its immense forces and its titanic enginery of destruction will undoubtedly show us consequences which will make all the previous records of carnage and desolation look small and pale.

All this cost the nations might afford to pay if they were getting for it some gain of freedom or welfare. But is there any such prize set before these combatants? I do not hear of it.

And yet, I doubt not this war will bring to the world at large some great gains—gains not sought by any of these combatants—gains not desired by most of them,—gains won in spite of them all.

It will bring, in the first place, such a demonstration, not only of the horrors of war, but of its futility, its stupidity as the arbiter of international relationships, that there will be a mighty revulsion against war, and we shall soon realize that we have seen the beginning of the end of it.

It will bring home to us, also, in the sufferings which we shall undergo through the rupture of all these industrial relations, and the interruption of human progress and the dislocation of so much of the order of the world on which we have learned to depend, the truth that for this world-industry and

world-commerce and world-finance and world-friendship we must have a world-peace.

It will bring the kings of this world and their ministers and chancellors—those of them especially, who are most responsible for this outbreak—to the bar of the world's judgment. It will convict them of the most stupendous blunder and the most ghastly crime of history. It will demand of them very pointedly, what reason they have to offer why they should not have their power considerably restricted. It may not insist on discrowning them, but it is pretty sure to give them notice that they have come into a new world-order, where nations are not plunderers of one another, or overlords one of another, but members one of another,—in which

“Each Christian nation shall take upon her  
The law of the Christian man in vast;  
The crown of the getter shall fall to the donor,  
And last shall be first, while first shall be last,  
And to love best shall still be to reign unsurpassed.”

Does this weakening of hereditary and absolute authority mean an enlargement of democracy? It cannot mean anything else.

And is the democracy ready to assume this added power? Alas, I fear not. It will make many grievous mistakes, I am sure. But of one thing we may be confident. It will never be possible for this democracy, in its maddest moments, to make such a colossal and criminal blunder as these lords of privilege are making now. It will never have, it can never obtain, the power to do mischief which the great ones of the earth are now exercising. So that we may await whatever changes may come in the world-order with some measure of equanimity.

What is the war bringing to this nation? Doubtless some are looking for improved industrial conditions and increased prosperity. That is not a reasonable expectation. Some special industries may be stimulated; in the shifting of the currents of trade some fortunes may be made; but on the whole, it will go the other way. Many industries will be crippled. Many men will be out of work, prices will be higher, we must be ready for close economies. It is to be hoped that the agony will not be prolonged, but we must remember that the nations of the earth are members of one another, and we have got to take some share of the suffering and loss which this war will bring. Our customers, over seas, are going to be impoverished, and it must affect our trade. In some ways, as I said, there will be gains, but on the whole we must be ready for losses. A good share of the world's wealth is going to be wiped out by this war, and the loss will be widely distributed. The immediate rise of prices bringing distress to the poorest is an indication of what will come. For while these conditions have, no doubt, been aggravated by conscienceless extortionists, they are in large degree the effect of



natural causes; for a considerable part of the world's supply of the necessities of life comes from these warring nations whose industries are now crippled.

One remote consequence of the war to this nation may be somewhat serious. When it is over we are likely to see a greatly increased immigration to this country. Unless there are speedy social readjustments over there, millions from all those warring nations will turn their faces westward. That will bring us heavy tasks and responsibilities. It looks as though our democracy were likely to be much less of a sinecure than we have been inclined to make it. I incline to the belief that this new invasion will bring to us much of the best of those populations; that there will be in it a great deal of very good material for citizenship; but there will be a loud call for intelligent and clean and consecrated leadership in welcoming these multitudes to our shores, and guiding them into the ways of useful occupation.

Such, then, are some of the consequences which we may confidently expect to follow this fearful war. It will bring waste and woe and desolation,—a heavier retribution I fear than the world has ever suffered; and such it ought to bring, for it is the blackest crime the world has ever committed. But after the night comes the morning, always, always! Out of this agony the world will win peace and liberty and plenty and good will. It is a heavy price that we are paying for good that might have been ours by just wishing for it and taking it; but perhaps the day will come—not in my time, I hope in yours—when it will be plain that it is worth all it has cost.

That mighty secular movement which we traced, at the beginning, will go forward; all the war-lords cannot stop it. Can you stay the morning star in his course? The nations will be drawn closer and closer in bonds of amity and helpful intercourse; we shall discover that we are not foes, but members one of another.

“Nation with nation, land with land,  
Unarmed shall dwell as comrades free;  
In every heart and brain will throb  
The pulse of one fraternity.”

Yes, it will come. It was never so near as it is today. It seems that the world needed one more demonstration of the futility of war, and the war-lords have undertaken to furnish one. Evidently it will be conclusive. There will be need of no further argument. Do not sneer at the Palace at The Hague; we shall have abundant use for it ere long, as the meeting place of the humbled and contrite nations when they gather to reduce the armaments and to prepare the ways of peace. And some of you will be here in the good day not far off, to hail

“The coming of the end,  
The last long Sabbath day of time,  
When peace from heaven shall descend  
Like heaven’s own light, on every clime!  
When men in ships far out at sea  
Shall hear the happy nations raise  
The songs of peace and liberty,  
The chant of overflowing praise.  
Mankind shall be one brotherhood;  
One human soul shall fill the earth,  
And God shall say, ‘The world is good  
As in the day I gave it birth.’ ”

Aug. 16, 1914.

## The Futility of Force

---

*For though we walk in the flesh we do not war according to the flesh; for the weapons of our warfare are not of the flesh but mighty before God to the casting down of strongholds.*  
II COR. X: 3, 4.

The world is always interested to hear from its great warriors how they won their battles. Paul, the apostle, is one of the greatest of the world's heroes. It is doubtful whether any man who has stood upon this planet (save the Master by whom and for whom Paul lived) has waged more effective warfare against the evil of the world than Paul waged. With the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of truth, he has marched down the centuries, conquering and to conquer. It is certain that he is one of the authors whose writings have been most widely read and most broadly influential. The hand which penned the twelfth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, and the twelfth and thirteenth and fifteenth chapters of First Corinthians, and the Epistles to the Philippians and the Ephesians, has probably done more to shape human destiny than any hand which has wrought in human affairs since Paul's work was finished. Paul always thought of himself as a warrior. The soldierly qualities are those he always claims. The campaign in which he is enlisted is the conquest and subjugation of the kingdoms of this world by the Kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. But he always takes pains to make it very plain that the warfare in which he is enlisted is a very different kind of warfare from that in which the armies of kings and emperors are engaged. "Not against flesh and blood," he says, is he ever contending. He is not fighting to hurt any man; no man is ever maimed or weakened by any blow that he strikes; he is fighting to destroy the evils that prey upon human life; he is fighting to break the fetters that cripple and enslave men.

But the one great truth on which he constantly dwells is the truth that the weapons of his warfare are not the weapons on which the Roman legionary relies. He has absolutely no use for the instruments of physical force. Neither with fists, nor clubs, nor spears, nor swords, nor with any of the enginery of physical destruction does he ever deal. "We walk in the flesh," he says; we are just ordinary human beings; we claim no angelic rank or prerogative; but "we do not war according to the flesh"; we have methods of overcoming our adversaries which are unlike those employed in ordinary warfare. "For the weapons of our warfare are not of the flesh [not carnal, as the old version has it], but mighty before God to the pulling down of strongholds."

Truth and love, these are the only weapons he ever employs.

Tell men the truth; get them to see things as they are; sweep the fogs of prejudice and tradition out of their brains; bring them face to face with reality—that is the first thing, and then win their love; get their affections awakened and enlisted in some human interest; draw out their hearts toward the wonder and the beauty of the world in which they live, and toward the companionships and the needs of the people round about them; fill their minds with truth and their hearts with love and you have conquered their worst enemies; you have set them free; you have won the battle for them. For the worst enemies of men are ignorance and darkness and prejudice and hatred and suspicion and ill-will; when these are overcome and driven forth, they have entered into life.

Such, then, is the nature of the warfare in which this good soldier was engaged, and such were the weapons with which he won his victories. The point to be emphasized is the superiority, the greater effectiveness, of these spiritual weapons. The weapons of our warfare are not physical, but they are mighty before God, to the pulling down of strongholds.

The only possible justification of warfare is the destruction of the evil of the world. It cannot be justified as a means of plunder, of aggression, of self-aggrandizement, of selfish conquest; for all such purposes it is an accursed thing.

It can only be tolerated when it promises to take away oppression, to break fetters, to release captives, to banish ignorance and darkness and misery. It may be that such evils are sometimes worse than the evils of war; that war with carnal weapons may be chosen as a means of escape from such evils.

But there is always the question which kind of weapons will be most effective in overcoming this evil of the world. In this good fight which weapons are mightiest, the weapons of force and fear or the weapons of truth and love?

I will not discuss at this time the policy of non-resistance; whether force is ever to be used in resisting and overcoming evil. Nice questions of casuistry emerge when that question is raised. I will admit, for the sake of my present argument, that emergencies arise in which force must be used. I am only inquiring today which is the stronger power; on which should we put our main reliance? Do we not often depend on carnal weapons, when the weapons that are not carnal would be far more effective? Are there not, indeed, a great many cases in which we insist on the use of physical force, or what is equivalent to physical force—on coercion of some kind—when coercion is absolutely futile, and when the only weapons should be the weapons of truth and love?

Is it not true, in short, that the use of physical force in contending against the evil of this world is enormously overdone, and that the strength of the moral forces is pitifully underrated, even by those who profess to put their trust in them?

It is a good time to consider this question because we are facing the most gigantic illustration of this foolishness that has ever been presented to the human mind.

The central evil of the world has always been the disposition of the peoples to prey upon one another and plunder one another, and devour one another; the great need of the world has been the abolishment of war, and the establishment of peace. For a long time it was impossible to get even this elementary idea recognized; most of the moralists insisted that war was essentially a good thing; that it was the nursing mother of all the great virtues; that without war the race would degenerate. So late an interpreter of history as the great German field marshal, Von Moltke, wrote not many years ago: "A perpetual peace is a dream and not even a beautiful dream. War is one of the elements of order in the world established by God. The noblest virtues of man are developed therein. Without war the world would degenerate and disappear in a morass of materialism."

Similar judgments have been freely expressed by newspaper philosophers even within the last month. But, for the most part, that position is no longer maintained. It is rather late in the centuries to argue that war is a good thing. We have some pretty strong testimony about that from the great soldiers. So the later defenders of force have retreated from that stronghold and have entrenched themselves behind this proposition: War is a curse, a blight upon civilization; it is the great evil from which the world must be delivered, and the only way to prevent war is to maintain strong armaments. This is the maxim which has ruled what we are pleased to call our civilization for the last quarter of a century. To secure ourselves against war let us increase the armament; double the battalions, multiply the ships. The only way to lessen the peril of physical force is to increase the amount of it. And this, of course, introduces the element of rivalry in making this provision. If France builds another fort, Germany enlists another army corps. If Germany votes another dreadnaught England votes two. All this rests upon the proposition that the only weapons with which this scourge of humanity can be successfully attacked are carnal weapons. If you want to see that proposition riddled, read in the Independent of August 17 Dr. Charles Jefferson's article on "The Nemesis of Armaments." One by one he takes up the pleas that have been urged in justification of armaments, and you see them shrivel in the flame of the conflagration now devastating Europe.

"'Armaments are the only sure guarantee of peace.' We have heard it a thousand times from men who seemed to know. It has been published in a thousand volumes and in ten thousand papers and so men come to accept it as the truth. . . . Through thirty years the work of increasing armaments has gone merrily on. It was in this way that sensible men worked for peace. . . . Not an appropriation for the increase of army or navy has been passed within the last twenty years by any parliament in the world, which has not been secured by men who were pleading for peace. . . . The peace of Europe, so all the wise men said, was due to armaments. It was a lie,

and the lie is now being shot to pieces before our eyes. It speaks well for the temper of the peoples of Europe that they have stood the strain so long. Armaments are provocative of war. You may increase them for a season, but at last you receive the retribution you invited."

Another of the pleas for armaments is that they are a form of national insurance. "Six nations of Europe," says Dr. Jefferson, "went into this scheme of insurance. Within the past thirty years they have paid in premiums six billion four hundred and ninety-two millions of dollars and now they find they are not insured at all. Some fool in southeastern Europe threw a lighted match and instantly all Europe was in flames. Why? The whole house had been saturated with kerosene. Military and naval budgets are not insurance, they are kerosene. Their function is to render a nation inflammable. Europe had been so repeatedly drenched with kerosene that one match was sufficient to start an instantaneous and continent-wide conflagration. . . . If one-tenth of the treasure spent by Europe in the last thirty years upon her armaments had been devoted to building national safeguards against war, the present catastrophe would never have blighted the world."

Another of the delusions concerning armaments which Dr. Jefferson demolishes, is the theory that they are the natural protection of righteousness and truth; that they help to control the savagery of the backward nations and to shelter the weak from the aggressions of the strong. But he shows how the strong nations stood armed around Turkey for years, when she was ravishing and butchering helpless peoples, and did not interfere to put an end to her atrocities, "simply because they were bound hand and foot by their armaments"; and how the Balkan states have just been turning their peninsula into a shambles—"and the great Christian Powers, like so many huge and unworldly brutes stood in armor impotent, watching the frightful carnage go on, all of them so weighted down with steel that not one could move."

Equally puerile is the plea that strong armies and navies guarantee the observance of conventions and treaties. We see how that is today. The stronger is the armament the more reckless is the disregard of all treaty stipulations.

So, then, the assumption on which the great military nations have been standing for the past three or four decades, that nothing but carnal weapons can be relied upon for the preservation of the world's peace and the maintenance of equity and righteousness, is shattered to fragments by the events now taking place before our eyes. It ought to have been obvious, from the first, that this was a perfectly irrational assumption. It ought to have been plain to those who know anything of human nature, that growths of good will are not promoted by the sowing of the seeds of hate and destruction; but this, unhappily, is a truth which it has been very hard to get this old world of ours to accept. This is the age-long failure of Christianity—this failure to believe in the might of the moral and spiritual forces.

Jesus bore testimony to it, in His life and in His death; Paul stood forth as the champion of the warfare which rejects carnal weapons, and trusts in truth and love. For two or three centuries Christianity rested mainly on this basis, and its triumphs were wonderful. Before the end of the third century it had gained possession of the larger part of the then known world. But then it was that it entered into its fatal alliance with the empire; it began to rely on carnal weapons, and from this point onward its vigor was reduced and its conquests were dubious. It swept whole tribes into its enclosures at the edge of the sword, and baptized them by platoons, but such additions to its numbers fatally lowered its standards of piety and morality, and introduced elements of corruption into its life from which it has never been able to free itself.

All the persecutions by which the church has been disfigured illustrate this fearful illusion—the persecutions of the Hussites in Bohemia; the persecutions of the Anabaptists by the Reformers; the persecution of Protestants in the days of Bloody Mary, and the persecution of both Catholics and Puritans in the days of Elizabeth; the persecution of Quakers and Baptists and Methodists by the Puritans themselves in New England—all these are instances of the proneness of the church to trust in carnal weapons.

Even in the time of the Reformation, when the effort was made to purge away some of the defilements which the worship of force had brought in, Luther and the other Reformers had far too much faith in the Protestant princes, and far too little in the truth and love on which their protest ought to have rested; so that they turned their backs on the peasants pleading for the recognition of their human rights, and relentlessly used the weapons that are carnal in strengthening their organization. The Reformation movement was impeded and weakened in its very beginnings by putting too much trust in carnal weapons.

And while it has been true of many branches of Protestantism that they have kept tolerably free from political entanglements, yet there has always been, in all branches of the church, far too strong a tendency to rely on materialistic forces rather than on moral and spiritual forces. And this really amounts to the same thing.

Money, for example, is the concentration and embodiment of material power; and the church which learns to depend on money, to permit the question of its revenues to shape its policy or influence its teaching, is making its warfare with carnal weapons.

There are other kinds of force also, besides physical force, which Christians sometimes use, and which they have no right to use. There are coercions which are not muscular. All attempts to put social pressure on people, to constrain them to adopt your opinions or follow your leaders, come under the category of fighting with carnal weapons. Truth and love are the only weapons Paul allowed himself to use—the only weapons any disciple of Jesus Christ has a right to wield. If you can

get your neighbor to see that your doctrine is true and your way is the right way and he goes with you heartily and from conviction, that is good Christian warfare. If you can enlist his interest in your cause or your leader and can inspire in him affection for yourself or your comrades and can thus secure his co-operation, that, too, is the thing to be desired. But to make him feel that his failure to agree with you will be regarded by you as an offense; that he will lose caste or standing by his refusal; that unless he joins your church, or your party, he will be made very uncomfortable and perhaps will suffer serious losses—this is to wage warfare with carnal weapons.

There is a good deal of this, I am sorry to say. There is a great deal more faith, among people who claim to be Christians, in the efficacy of methods more or less coercive, than in the persuasive power of truth and love. If you venture to disagree, in your opinion, with your Christian neighbors, I should say that probably where one of them will try, by friendly arguments, to change your opinions, at least ten of them will denounce you as a hypocrite and a traitor and a coward, and will endeavor to convince you that you have forfeited the respect of decent people. I have had large experience in this line and feel qualified to testify.

This shows, of course, how much more faith people generally have in methods of violence than they have in methods of reason and love. But what strikes me most forcibly in the use of these coercive tactics is not so much their brutality as their futility. Do such people really think that by their abusive and bullying policy they are going to strengthen the cause they have at heart? Do they suppose that denunciation and vilification of those who differ from them is likely to convert them to their way of thinking? Judging from my own experience I should say that it would not. When a man abuses me for not thinking as he does I am disposed to think that his position must be a very weak one. As to the question whether I am a coward or a traitor I am in a position to know much better than he can know whether these charges are true or not and if I am satisfied in my own mind that they are not true, I lose confidence in his judgment, and am not likely to be instructed by him as to what I should believe. Really I can think of few things more stupid than the personal abuse of the man who differs from you in opinion. If he is the bad man you say he is—a truckler and a black-hearted traitor—your denunciation will not change his evil purpose; and if he is a good man with erroneous opinions your accusations against his character, which he knows to be untrue, are not likely to convince him of his error.

It is strange to what extent the human mind is warped from its integrity by the use of this kind of controversy. Men get into these ways of arguing and become unaware of their own mental obliquity. I remember a story which Miss Addams once told me of a conversation with Tolstoi, about his doctrine of non-resistance. Miss Addams believes in that doctrine her-



self, and lives up to it, too, I think, pretty consistently; and she made bold to say to the Count: "You are opposed to the use of force, and so am I; but how about violent language? Isn't that about the same thing? I think that I would rather be struck with the fist than to have hard and hateful words spoken to me or about me?"

"What was his reply?" I asked.

"He hadn't much to say," she said. Manifestly not. The keen question had pierced the joints of his armor. The great champion of non-resistance needed the reproof. For words which are barbed with bitterness are carnal weapons, just as truly as bullets or brickbats.

Another illustration of the perverse determination of the American people to trust in force rather than in truth and love, is the growing tendency to promote moral reforms by political methods. I am quite sure that this is a growing tendency. The church and the state have not been formally connected in this country since the adoption of our national constitution, and cannot be so long as that remains unchanged; but the church, in these later years, has been increasingly relying on the power of the state to do the work which she is called to do.

I am thinking now specially of the work of moral reform—of correcting such evils as drunkenness and licentiousness. It would seem that this should be primarily the work of the church, and that it should be mainly done by moral and spiritual agencies. Of course I am not denying that something may be done by law to lessen or prevent these evils. The Christian people are citizens, and as such they are bound to use the machinery of legislation as efficiently as they can to resist these evils. What the apostle calls carnal weapons can be used and must be used in this warfare.

But the Christian people are equipped with weapons of another sort which are far mightier, before God, to the casting down of these strongholds of vice, than any which can be wielded by the state. The weapons that are not carnal, the weapons of truth and love, are a hundred times more efficient than the weapons of force. Law can do something, but, as Paul says, it is weak, through the flesh. It is simply an instrument of force. It says: "You shall" or "you shall not." It deals wholly with the will. It does not touch the central sources of conduct, the convictions, the wishes, the affections, the choices. It can forbid a man to sell or to buy liquor. It cannot convince him that liquor is not good for him, and that he is better off without it. It can shut up the open bagnio. It cannot cleanse the lustful heart.

Now I am not saying that the little which law can do should not be done, nor that the disciples of Jesus Christ should not be zealous to see that it is done; but I am saying that their conduct proves that they have a great deal more faith in carnal weapons than they have in spiritual weapons; that in dealing with these problems of social vice they put vastly more emphasis on the legal measures for its suppression than they do on the moral measures for its extirpation. In all this campaign against

social vice the churches have proved, over and over, that their main reliance is on force rather than on truth and love.

That is the reason why county option has been in so many cases a comparative failure. When the victory was won at the polls, the victors went home and folded their hands. The law had been invoked and set in operation, and nothing either great or small remained for them to do. If they had understood their business, they would have realized that the battle was just begun. That was the time for rallying the moral forces of the community; for saturating the public mind with the truth about the evils of drunkenness; for organizing friendly social agencies for those on whom the doors of the saloon had been closed; for offering a helpful hand to the men who had been put out of business, to assist them to other employment and make them aware that their neighbors held no personal grudges against them and wished for their welfare. How much there is that needs to be done for a community which has called in the law to close its drinking places! What an opportunity is offered then for vigilant, large-hearted, intelligent Christian work, to heal the wounds and adjust the dislocations and conserve the moral gains! Has much of this kind of work been done in the towns and counties that have gone dry? Something, perhaps, but very little. The importance of this kind of work is but feebly apprehended by the churches at large. The real sources of their power are hidden from their sight. They are so obsessed by the notion of curing the evils of the world by law that they have largely forgotten how to use the moral forces with which they have been intrusted.

That is a serious criticism, but I shall have to let it stand, appealing for its truth to the verdict of the coming years.

What I am trying to point out to you is the prevailing tendency of the world—a tendency in which the church has permitted itself to be largely implicated—to put its trust in the methods of force, instead of the methods of truth and love. And I am calling your attention to it today, because we have before our eyes such an appalling demonstration of the futility of force.

All the great nations of the earth have been gathering into their hands, for the last quarter of a century, as much as they could of the physical force of the world, for one great moral purpose—the prevention of war, the preservation of peace. We have their word for it; that is the great end they have had in view. And they have insisted that the only method by which this result could be secured was the accumulation of force—physical force, destructive force. They had no abiding faith in anything else; small faith in ideas; less faith in moral agencies; a feeble faith in the cultivation of friendships and co-operations among the nations; no real working faith in anything but force.

I do not know that the church can severely censure them for having entertained this faith in force: she herself, as we have seen, has been quite too much inclined to look for her strength to the same sources. But she must be interested in the

result of this experiment. With all the rest of the world she is watching the fulfillment of the trust of the nations in their mighty aggregation of force for the preservation of peace. Has any disillusion more dramatic ever been flashed in the face of the children of men? We see now just what all this argument amounts to by which we are urged to seek moral ends by immoral means; to gather grapes from thorns or figs from thistles. Europe is writhing in agony today, in the grip of the forces which have been gathered for the preservation of peace!

Is there any lesson in this which the church needs to learn? Her one deadly weakness has been her lack of faith in moral and spiritual agencies; her willingness to resort to coercion or fraud in the accomplishment of her purposes; her craven misgiving that the weapons of light and love were not strong enough to overcome the evil, and that if you wanted to win you must make judicious use of carnal weapons.

It would seem as if Divine Providence, after long patience with this crippling infidelity, had determined to gather up into one colossal object lesson the natural consequences of it and let the world and the church see precisely what is involved in this purblind policy. And it does seem as though the world, and the church, must be learning some lessons in these days that they cannot easily forget.

These are momentous days through which we are passing. Such an overturning of kingdoms and thrones as we see impending, such a shaking of the earth and the heavens, must bring some profound changes in the structure of human society, in the ruling ideas of men. It will not be the same world, after these convulsions have subsided. The map of Europe will be remade; constitutions will be rewritten; the foundations of a new social order will emerge.

May we not hope that as part of the grain which will be saved out of this winnowing the world may get the conviction of the futility of force—the conviction that the interests of righteousness and peace and freedom are best promoted by other methods than those of coercion and violence? I hope that the militant suffragettes will take time to consider this, and that the I. W. W. and the Anarchistic Socialists will pay good heed to it; that all the dynamiters will think it over, and that those representatives of the employing classes who are meditating the subjugation of the laboring classes will reflect upon it; that all men who think that the right way to promote the causes they have at heart is to vilify and traduce those who disagree with them, will give some attention to it; above all, that the Christian Church will try to find room in its ruling convictions for this truth that the weapons which are not carnal are the mighty weapons; that the meekness and gentleness of Christ are forces that can be trusted to win and to hold the kingdoms of this world.

After so many centuries of dallying and fumbling with the agencies of materialism, and after such a cosmical demonstration of their impotence, may we not believe that the Christian Church will be wise enough to renounce its faith in the weapons

that are carnal—in all forms of them—and put on its own shining armor of light and love? What a glorious church it would be, if it could rise to this vision; if it could cast itself boldly on the truth as it is in Jesus! How soon the strongholds of hate and strife would fall before it; and the world would be subdued to the obedience of Christ.

One thing is sure, this war will soon be over. In the nature of the case it cannot last long. Starvation will put an end to it, and starvation cannot be far off. It will leave a horrible wreck behind it, but it will be over. We shall be past its noise and its smoke and its moral confusion, and there will be a great silence in the earth, a silence in which we shall be able, I trust, to revise many of our theories, and to reconsider our ruling ideas, and to renounce some of our worst obsessions, and to rebuild our lives on the sure foundations of truth and love.

“When the cannon booms,  
When the snare drums rattle fiercely,  
And the feet of men in khaki hammer time on the pave,  
It is easy to be brave;  
It is easy to believe God is angry with the other man, our brother,  
And has left the sword of Gideon in our wayward human hand,  
When the cannon booms.

“When the cannon booms,  
When the battle flags are fluttering and men are going mad  
With the blind desire for glory,  
Filled with visions grand and gory,  
It is easy to assent  
To the Corsican blasphemer’s scoffing creed.  
It is easy to believe God is with the big battalions,  
Whether cherubim or hellions,  
When the cannon booms.

“When the cannon booms,  
When the primal love of fighting stirs the tiger in our blood,  
And the fascinating smell  
Of the sulphur fumes of hell  
Rouses memories of the pit from which our human nature rose,  
It is easy to forget,  
God was not found in the earthquake, in the strong wind or the  
fire;  
It is easy to forget how at last the prophet heard Him  
As a still, small voice,  
When the cannon booms.

“When the cannon booms,  
When the war lords strut and swagger  
And the battleships are plowing for the bitter crop of death,  
While the shouting rends the ear  
Echoing from the empyrean,  
It is difficult to hear  
Through the din the Galilean  
With His calm voice preaching peace on earth to men!  
'Twill be easier to claim,  
If we will, the Christian name,  
To become as little children and be men of gentle will,  
When the cannon booms, the cannon booms no more.”

WILLIAM HERBERT CARRUTH.

Aug. 23, 1914.

## Is Christianity a Failure?

---

*For the time is come for judgment to begin at the house of God.*  
I PETER IV: 18.

During a recent absence from home I received two letters from two of my younger brothers in the Congregational ministry, with both of whom my relations have been rather intimate, telling me of changes of a somewhat radical nature which had occurred in their ministry. These were not changes in theological belief, for they both continue to hold, so far as I know, the same opinions that they have held for a good while; they were rather changes in their attitude toward organized Christianity. One of them had found it impossible to co-operate with the church of which for several years he had been pastor; the freedom which he sought for the expression of his views on certain social matters had been denied him, and he had withdrawn from the church and was organizing an independent religious society which was to meet in a theater. The basis of their new organization, so far as I could see, was not only broadly, but deeply Christian; it was meant to represent, with simplicity and fullness, the principles of the Gospel of Christ.

The other of my friends had not gone so far. With his church he had had no misunderstanding, and he had not withdrawn from its pastorate, but he had been growing into a conviction, which his congregation appeared to share with him, that the church, as at present organized, is not efficient for the service needed by the kingdom, and he had proposed to his people that they abandon, for the present, their ordinary preaching service, and come together, every Sunday morning, to study the Sermon on the Mount, to see if they can find out what Christianity really is—what it means to be a Christian; and whether any of them, and, if any, how many of them, are ready to follow the light which they shall find and to put in practice the religion of Jesus. They seem to have agreed that this might require considerable change in their manner of life, and they had come to the point at which they were ready to confront that possibility. What those changes might be they did not know; that was what they were going to try to find out in those Sunday morning studies.

It is significant, also, that this action on their part, was precipitated by the present war. It was the spectacle of the great Christian nations, flying at each other's throats, which had constrained them to stop and ask themselves, "What is Christianity anyhow? Does Christianity contemplate or tolerate such things as these? Are we implicated in a system which has room in it for such horrible brutalities? Let us try to find out what our religion permits and requires and what we mean when we say we are Christians."

I think that such questions have been started in a good many minds during the past four months. This war is probing our creeds and our convictions; it is applying the acid test to our theories and our institutions, political, social and religious; before we are through with it we shall have to do some serious thinking.

At any rate the contents of these letters from my two friends were sufficient to afford me much food for thought. If they had been rash and radical men it would have been different, but they are both very thoughtful, very sincere, very unselfish men and their difficulties could not be lightly dismissed.

The two books which occupied most of the time of my journey across the continent were Rudolph Eucken's, "Can We Still be Christians?" and Stanton Coit's, "The Soul of America." The great German's inquiry seemed strangely pertinent. That is surely what we want to know. Eucken's book was written some time before the war, however, and does not touch the burning issues; it is a profound philosophic treatise and deals with the underlying principles of Christianity; and his answer is, not only that we can still be Christians, but that we must be; that Christianity gives the only rational solution to the great problems of life; but—and this is the arresting suggestion—that the churches as now organized, Protestant and Catholic, do not represent Christianity; that it will be necessary for us to find some better form in which the spirit of Christianity may incarnate and express itself. That is surely an impressive verdict from one who has been hailed as the great champion of the Christian faith.

Dr. Coit's book is a stirring plea for the merging of all our religious organizations in one which shall represent and express the national ideal. The spirit of America is for him the supreme object of worship. And he holds that we shall never reach our highest development until our hearts are united in this lofty devotion. He does not urge us to abandon our existing church organizations, but rather to supplement our present aims and ideals by unitedly cultivating the national ideal. "The Religious Congregations of America" he says "must assume the task of educating the American public to deify the Moral Genius of the United States. It is the task of the churches to bring widely before the people the invisible glory and hidden meaning of their own responsibility and opportunity." This suggests a view of their function which would certainly give quite a new direction to the central ideas and activities of many of them.

On reaching home I found awaiting me the November Atlantic Monthly with an article on "The Failure of the Church," by Edward Lewis. I have known Mr. Lewis, through his pen, for several years; some time before I knew his name I had been following his articles which appeared over a pseudonymous signature in an English journal, and I have found him a thinker of quick insight and a courageous and stimulating teacher. Not long ago he startled his brethren in the British ministry by resigning an influential pulpit in London and announcing his purpose of taking up an independent ministry. This article on "The

Failure of the Church," gives his reasons for so doing. Evidently he has lost faith in organized religion. He expects the world to be Christianized, he wants to help, but he has no hope that the work will be done by the organized church. "Religion flourishes, the organized church decays." And he goes on to tell us the reasons why. Not to multiply such testimonies, of which there are many, let me mention only one more,—John Galsworthy's passionate outcry in the November Scribner entitled, "Thoughts on This War." Thus it begins:

"Three hundred thousand church spires raised to the glory of Christ! Three hundred million human beings baptized into His service! And—war to the death of them all! Let your hearts beat to God and your fists in the face of the enemy!" "In prayer we call God's blessing on our valiant troops!"

"God on the lips of each potentate, and under three hundred thousand spires prayer that twenty-two million servants of Christ may receive from God the blessed strength to tear and blow each other to pieces, to ravage and burn, to wrench husbands from wives, fathers from their children, to starve the poor, and everywhere destroy the works of the spirit. Prayer under three hundred thousand spires for the blessed strength of God to use the noblest, most loyal instincts of the human race to the ends of carnage! God be with us to the death and dishonor of our foes! (Whose God He is, no less than ours.) The God who gave His only begotten Son to bring on earth peace and good will toward men!

"No creed—in these days when two and two are put together—can stand against such reeling subversion of the foundation. After this monstrous mockery, beneath this grinning skull of irony, how shall there remain faith in a religion preached and practised to such ends? When this war is over and reason resumes its sway, our dogmas will all be found to have been scored through forever. Whatever else be the outcome of this business, let us at least realize the truth: It is the death of mystic Christianity! Let us will that it be the birth of an ethic Christianity that men can really practise!"

It is a sharp challenge, brothers, which is thus thrown in the face of organized Christianity, and it comes at a rather critical juncture. For some time thoughtful and candid men have been regarding with some concern the condition of the Protestant Churches; few of them have been growing; many of them are barely holding their own, some of them are losing ground, and signs that something was wrong were more and more apparent. Now comes this tremendous crash in which the whole fabric of modern civilization seems to be tottering to its fall. We have been calling it Christian civilization. It has generally been assumed that Christianity was responsible for it. Nothing is more inevitable, therefore, than that it should be hailed by those who disbelieve in Christianity as the collapse of that religion. We have all heard it said, a hundred times, within the past four months, "The war proves that Christianity is a failure!"



But what do we mean by Christianity? How is it shown to be a failure? Words are often used very loosely, not only in common conversation, but in argumentative discourse. It is well to have reference to the dictionary and make sure of our definitions before we begin our discussions.

Christianity, in a general sense, is the religion founded by Jesus Christ; but the dictionary says that it is properly divided into Historical Christianity, Dogmatic Christianity, and Vital Christianity. Let us consider each of these:

(a) Historical Christianity connotes the facts and principles stated in the New Testament, "especially those concerning the life, sufferings, death, resurrection, ascension and nature of Jesus together with the subsequent development of the Christian Church."

Christianity in this sense cannot be said to have been proved a failure by the war. Historical Christianity is a fact; it has existed for nineteen centuries, and has exercised more or less influence in the world. The war cannot cancel or obliterate a historical fact.

(b) Dogmatic Christianity is made up of "the systems of theological doctrine, founded on the New Testament. These systems differ with different churches, sects and schools." There is a great variety of such systems. When we say that Christianity has failed do we mean that all of them have been proved untrue, or that some of them have been; and if some of them, which of them? The statement lacks definiteness. It is more than probable that some of these dogmatic explanations of Christianity have been more or less disfigured and discredited by the things which are happening in Europe, but it is necessary to specify more particularly before we undertake to judge.

(c) "Vital Christianity is *the spirit manifested by Jesus Christ in His life and which He commanded His followers to imitate.*" Has this been proved a failure? Where, in connection with this war, in the disputes in which it originated or in the conduct of it, has it made its appearance? It cannot have failed, for it has not been tried.

I suppose that those who say that Christianity has failed are looking at the nations and the churches. Most of the great nations engaged in this war are called "Christian nations." Turkey and Japan do not claim to be Christian nations, but the others all do—Germany, France, Russia, Austria, Servia, England; they are all put down in the geography as "Christian nations." And the ecclesiastical organizations mainly prevailing in all these countries are Christian organizations. Christianity is supposed to be represented by these nations and by these churches.

Under this supposition it is not to be denied that Christianity is a failure.

Consider first the nations. If they are in any proper sense of the word Christian nations, if Christianity can be held to be represented by their national policy and practise, then Christianity is indeed a deadly failure. For the theory on which all

these states have hitherto sought to adjust their relations to each other—what Mr. Lowes Dickinson calls “the governmental theory”—the theory that states “are natural enemies, [that] they have always been so and they always will be, and [that] force is the only arbiter between them”—this theory is proving itself now, on these blood-soaked plains of Europe, the most ghastly blunder that human stupidity has ever committed. These nations have been trying to build civilization on the foundations of suspicion and fear and greed and enmity; and what we are witnessing is the natural and inevitable consequence. If Christianity is responsible for this; if they are in this conflict because they are Christian nations, if they are illustrating Christianity, then Christendom may well behold in the aeroplane that flits across the lurid sky above some burning city a symbol of the balances in which systems are tested, with the legend that Belshazzar read but could not interpret: “TEKEL—thou art weighed in the balances and found wanting.”

But are these nations, any of them in their political structure, in the ruling ideas of their statecraft, Christian nations? All of them contain many Christian elements; among their peoples are cherished institutions, influences, tendencies, sentiments which are truly Christian; even in the laws of most of them Christian principles are incorporated; but the states in their national policies, and especially in their international policies, are far from being Christian. For, if I may quote Mr. Dickinson again, it is the universal assumption that “*they are in perpetual and inevitable antagonism to one another, and though they may group themselves in alliances, that can only be for temporary purposes to meet some other alliance or single power. For states are bound by a moral or physical obligation to expand indefinitely, each at the cost of the others.*” This, I say, is the traditional and almost universal theory of the relations of states. This theory is the root out of which this war has sprung. And this theory is the exact antithesis of Christianity—of the Christianity of Jesus Christ.

For the simplest, the most primary, the most elemental principle of Christianity is that all nations and peoples are the children of one Father in heaven; that we are all brothers and friends; that antagonisms between individuals or between tribes are unnatural and abominable; that we are here in the world together to share the good of the world, to be helpers of each other’s property, and promoters of each other’s peace. If these nations had been governing themselves by this principle, there would have been no war. When they ignore and spurn this principle, and base their policy upon the anti-Christian assumption of national antagonism and enmity it is absurd to call them Christian nations, and ridiculous to speak of the wreck and ruin into which their conduct has plunged them as a failure of Christianity.

But how about the church? We said that the organizations of religion in these nations that call themselves Christian are organizations bearing the Christian name and that they are

supposed to represent Christianity. Has not Christianity, as represented by them, proved to be a failure? That, indeed, it might be difficult to deny.

But do these religious organizations, which we find in these warring nations, truly represent Christianity? No; they do not. It is quite impossible that they should. For, in the first place, they do not agree. Christianity, in its essence, must be one; it was the thought and the prayer and the purpose of Jesus that His disciples might be one; that they might be conscious of their unity; that they might unitedly bear testimony for the truth He came to teach. Behold they are split into numberless sects and factions; they dispute and contradict one another; they cannot agree about the truth He taught, nor about Him; oftentimes they bitterly hate and suspect and malign one another. Can such a ruck and rabble of sects represent the truth as it is in Jesus? Is it possible for them to embody and express with coherency and convincing clearness the principles of Christianity? The one big business of Christianity is to bring the world into unity; and organized Christianity stands before the world as the symbol of division rather than of unity. Here is the great schism by which the Eastern and Western churches—each with a strange lack of humor, proclaiming itself Catholic—are torn apart and set in antagonism to each other; and here are the numerous racial groups of oriental nations which have no dealings with either of these Catholic orthodoxies nor with one another; and here are the multitudinous sects of what we call Protestantism—some of them loudly protesting that they are not Protestant—all of them looking sharply for their line-fences and more concerned for the perpetuation of their divisions than for the unity of the body of Christ—is it possible that these fractions, any or all of them, should have the right or the power to represent Christianity?

Let us understand. I am not saying that there is no Christianity in these churches; there is a great deal of it. There are a great many individuals, a great many families, a great many groups of philanthropic workers, a great many local churches which may fairly be called Christian; the leaven of Christianity is found at work in manifold ways in society; the seed of good will is widely sown, and it is bringing forth the peaceable fruits of Christianity, not so abundantly as we could wish, but still sufficiently to affect very greatly the social order. But organized Christianity, as represented in the ecclesiasticisms, is a very different thing from this vital Christianity which propagates itself from heart to heart and from life to life. Vital Christianity has not wholly failed, though its work has been greatly crippled by its divisions and the perversions of its message which have been produced by ecclesiasticism; but organized Christianity is a signal and dismal failure. Of this the present war is convincing proof. For while it is not the business of the church to rule the state, but to keep its hands off the political machinery, it is its business to saturate the minds of the people with Christian ideas and principles—with the sense of the divine

Fatherhood and the human brotherhood; with the conviction that we are members one of another and prosper not by what we hoard but by what we share. And the outstanding fact is that while individuals and families and lesser groups have grasped these central principles of Christianity, the two great realms of human activity—the economic realm and the political realm—have not been greatly influenced by them; the churches have not succeeded in Christianizing politics or business. Christian principles—the principles of good will, of brotherhood, of friendship—have been treated in these realms as sentimentalisms, rather than as rules of conduct.

It is with the national aspect that we are chiefly concerned today, though the other is inextricably connected with it. The fact now confronting us is that the churches have failed to Christianize the political life of the nations. They have failed to convince the people that they are and ought to be friends. They have rather assumed that "states are natural enemies," and "that force is the only arbiter between them." Of course there have been people in all the churches and in all ages of the church who have accepted the teachings of Christ about the divine Fatherhood and the human brotherhood, and have preached them with all earnestness; but the churches as organizations have never believed these teachings; how could they, divided as they were—spurning for themselves the bond of fellowship, holding each other in contempt and fear? The assumption of the governmental authorities that the natural relation of states is one of enmity and antagonism, and that each ought to be in a constant state of preparedness for bloody conflicts with all its neighbors, is an assumption which the churches have never boldly and resolutely challenged. They have practically assented to it. They have never risen up with the passion of Christian conviction, to denounce it as the doctrine of anti-Christ, and to drive it from the earth. They have rather apologized for it, and abetted it; there has been no clear, convincing, persistent testimony from the church against the theory of the natural enmity of nations.

This is the palpable failure of the churches—their horrible, deadly failure—which every day is bringing into clearer light. This is the one great thing that they ought to have done, and that they have failed to do. This is the truth which the whole world is slowly taking in. Clearer and clearer it is becoming that the churches ought to have prevented this war—ought to have put an end to all war long before this; that if they had believed the simple truth of universal brotherhood which Jesus came to teach, and had put it at the front of all their teaching and had driven it home to human hearts, this horrible collapse of civilization could not have occurred. But it is not Christianity that has failed; it is the churches that have failed, and they have failed for the lack of Christianity; because the vast majority of them are not and have never dared to be consistently and thoroughly Christian.

I think that one of the sure results of this war will be a sharp reckoning with the churches because of this failure. Nay, I think that the churches are going to call themselves to account. They cannot ignore these unhappy conditions. They are bound to ask themselves some searching question: "Why is it," they will be constrained to demand, "that these nations which we have been claiming as Christian nations have been filling the earth with rapine and slaughter? Why have they been ravaging the fairest fields of earth and wrecking its noblest monuments of art, and ploughing the lands with trenches wherein are cast the bodies of hundreds of thousands of their young men, and plunging millions who were living in comfort into the depths of poverty, and leaving countless myriads of widows and orphans to loneliness and misery? Why were these nations left to fall into this abyss of iniquity? All these great nations are Christian nations. Most of these rulers and counselors and captains have been baptized into the name of Christ and have sworn allegiance to Him. Do they not know his law? Have they not heard His Gospel? Has no one told them that they are all children of a common Father—all brothers by blood? They have all been acting as though they were born to be natural enemies, as though suspicion and fear and hate were the only bonds between them. Why this madness? Who is to blame for these horrible delusions?

"Alas, the blame must be ours. We, the churches of Jesus Christ, must own that it is our fault. We were put in truth with the Gospel and we have not been faithful to our trust. We have been timid or stammering, or false witnesses. We have never enforced, as we ought to have enforced, the Gospel of peace upon these kings and lords and rulers of men. We have apologized for war—have glorified it sometimes; we have stood by, without protesting, while the lords of misrule were kindling the suspicions, cultivating the fears, exciting the enmities, building the armaments which must breed war: and we have never lifted up our voices as we ought to have done to denounce this madness, to reprove these enmities, to heal this distemper. We might have done it. We ought to have done it. We had in our armories the stores, in our keeping the resources of light and love with which we might have put an end to this bloody business long ago. For the weapons of our warfare, though not carnal, are mighty, under God for the pulling down of these strongholds of hate.

"We have not done it, and this is our sin and our shame. It is because we have failed to do it, that these horrible things are taking place. But it is not Christianity that has failed; it is we who have failed to enforce and incarnate and apply Christianity—it is we who have failed. And our failure in this is a symptom and an indication of our weakness and delinquency in many things.

"It is time for judgment to begin at the house of God. This war is calling us to a revision of our standards, to a sharp reconsideration of our ideas, our plans, our arms. Something is

the matter with the church; let us find out what it is. Only let us not listen any longer to those who prate to us about going back to the religion of some old day. That is a good part of what ails us. We have been going back quite too persistently—we had better go the other way. 'Forgetting the things that are behind—stretching forward to the things that are before,'—that is our slogan."

Mr. Lewis tells us in the article to which I referred in the beginning, that one of the first articles of belief for a truly religious man within the Christian community is that there is a "Beyond Christianity!" Yes; there is always a beyond for everything that lives and grows. But for most of the churches of this day the call is not to go beyond Christianity, but to overtake it if they can. It is a long ways ahead of them. They will have to get rid of a good deal of their baggage and quicken their marching step if they expect to catch up with it in time to share its triumphs. For Christianity has been moving much more rapidly than the church has been moving during the last generation.

I quoted what Mr. Galsworthy said about the doom of mystic Christianity. I don't know just what he means by mystic Christianity, but I am convinced that there is something unreal there which will have to go. Let me close with what he says about that which will take its place, and which "has already been a long time preparing to come forward":

"I know not what it will be called or whether it will even receive a name. It will be too much in earnest to care for such a ceremony. But one thing is certain, it will be far more Christian than the Christianity which has brought us to these present ends. Its creed will be a noiseless and passionate conviction that man can be saved, not by a far-away despotic God who can be enlisted by each combatant for the destruction of his foes, but by the divine element in man, the God within the human soul. . . . The creed will be a fervent, almost secret application of the saying, 'Love thy neighbor as thyself.' It will be ashamed of appeals to God to put right that which man has bungled, of supplications to the deity to fight against the deity. It will have the pride of the artist and the artisan. And it will have its own mysticism, its own wonder at the mystery of the all-embracing Principle, which has produced such a creature as this man, with such marvelous potentiality for the making of fine things and living of fine lives; such heroism, such savagery; such wisdom and such blank stupidity; such a queer, insuperable instinct for going on, and on, and ever on."

Dec. 13, 1914.

## What Will End the War?

---

*Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.*—ISA. II: 4.

I hesitated, before announcing my subject for tonight, upon the phrasing of it; whether I should say: "How the War Must End"; or "How the War Will End"; but concluded finally to start out with this phrase: "What Will End the War?" Perhaps it would have been still better to say, "What *would* end it"; for I feel very sure that I know what would end it, more sure than I am of what will end it. Quite a number of things might be mentioned which would end it, but some of them are not likely to happen. I would rather speak of those which are more likely to happen.

Of one thing we are sure — the war will end. That is a future certainty which it is well to contemplate. All troubles have an end. There never was a night that was not followed by morning, never a storm which did not end in sunshine, never a winter which was not the forerunner of spring. Tuck that away in your memory, and bring it out now and then, and look at it. There was never a war which was not followed by peace — though there have been periods when wars lasted long and men waited months and years for peace. Peace was once but an interval between wars, often too brief; of late the proportion has been changing and peace is now over all the earth more nearly the permanent condition; war has become the interval. Let us trust that the day is not far off when peace shall be permanent and unbroken, a peace which no war shall follow.

Some of us will be obliged to confess that this war has lasted much longer than we thought possible; we thought the fury must spend its force in a few weeks; we were not good prophets. The end seems farther off now than it did at the beginning. For one thing we did not believe that the kings of the earth could stand and see so many of their young men killed and so much desolation and misery spread abroad in the earth. We thought their hearts would have relented and that their consciences would have revolted before now at the suffering for which they have made themselves responsible. They seem determined to give us some new impression of the cruelty that can hide in human hearts.

When I speak of what will end the war I am not thinking chiefly of the particular circumstances which may bring about the cessation of conflict and carnage. That may result from the exhaustion of the combatants; they may possibly fight each other to a standstill, and cease for very weariness. That, perhaps, is the result most to be desired — no very decisive defeat or victory — rather a drawn battle. A smashing defeat of eith-

er side would not end it; it would be but a suspension of hostilities. Germany dealt France a crushing blow in 1870, and the forty-four years that have elapsed since then have simply been years of preparation for the next battle. Nothing, in fact, is so undecisive as a great victory, unless, indeed the defeated party is practically annihilated, and that, in this case, is hardly likely to occur. The alternative of a victory decisive enough on either side to permit the dictation by the victors of the terms of peace are well set forth by Mr. Lowes Dickinson, an Englishman, in the *Atlantic Monthly*:

"Let us suppose that the German powers win. We know well enough what kind of peace they will impose, for they have been at no pains to conceal their ambition. 'France must be so completely crushed that she can never come again across our path.' So General Bernhardi, voicing, it may be presumed the policy of the military caste that is master of Germany. The same, of course, applies to England. She shall be shorn of her empire, of her command of the seas, of all that the German state has hated and envied in the British state. Italy and the Balkans will be pillaged to the benefit of Austria, and Russia rolled back — though that would be all to the good — from her ambition to expand in the west. At the same time, every democratic movement in every country will be discouraged or annihilated. The principle of a brutal military domination will be established as the principle of Europe. The countries that are not militant will become so. And another reign of armed peace will begin, in which every genuine interest of civilization, all the true life of men and women will be sacrificed to the desperate effort of the defeated nations to recover their position and of the victorious ones to maintain theirs.

"If, on the other hand, the Allies should win, the outlook is no more promising, if the diplomats are to have their way. The Allies, in that case, will endeavor finally to crush the German powers, as the latter are determined to finally crush the Allies. The English and the French will take the German colonies, Russia will dominate the Balkans, and probably appropriate Constantinople and a great slice of German territory. And France and England will be left face to face with what they will regard as the new menace of the Slav. With the result that in another quarter of a century or more they will combine with their present enemies to resist the advance of their present ally.

"In either case the state of Europe will be the old bad state; the piling up of armaments, at the cost of the continued poverty and degradation of the mass of the people; the destruction of all hope and effort toward radical social reform; and when the time comes, as in this case it infallibly will, the new war, the new massacre, the new impoverishment,—the perpetual and intolerable agony of a civilization forever struggling to the light, forever flung back by its own stupidity and wickedness into the hell in which at this moment it is writhing. Lord, how long, how long?"

Thus it is plain that the war will not be ended by crushing



defeats or drastic policies. Such measures are as rational as the attempt to cure a boil by pounding it with a hammer. The one gigantic delusion of the militants is that peace and warfare and contentment and happiness can be shot into human beings with shrapnel or prodded into them with bayonets. But peace and warfare and happiness are plants that do not thrive under such culture. The great ones of the earth have been "settling" Europe with war and war-bred diplomacy now for some centuries and we are beholding the crowning success of their policy. It is worse, of course, than anything which has preceded, because the vast improvement that science has made in the instruments of transportation and the engines of destruction enables it to be. The next time—if there is a next time—the havoc will be fiercer, because the butchering tools will be deadlier. If they can keep up this delusion for another quarter of a century and feed the minds of the common people of each nation with the hellish suspicion that all the other nations are enemies, all bent on their destruction, they may be able to get five or ten million more of them to kill one another in the next fell harvesting. This is the method, hitherto practised, of "settling Europe." War is not ended by such devices.

I think that the world will insist that this war shall be ended, not with a comma and a dash, but with a big black period. I think that there is gathering in the hearts of the children of men, all the world over, a wrath, deep, hot, portentous, against the whole system of war, with all its postulates, all its apologies, all its devices,—an indignation that will blaze and roar in the palaces and the chancelleries and the senate houses until the men who shape the policies of nations will be constrained to give heed.

Who will voice this protest? Well, I hope that those whose function it is to reprove the sins of the world and to lead men away from paths of destruction will not be altogether derelict. Those whose responsibility is heaviest have spoken but feebly hitherto; let us hope that they will soon find their voices.

From the artists, the poets, the whole great guild of witnesses of the light, we hear already some cogent testimonies. Never before, I think, in the hour of any great war, has there been such a thunderous protest against war as we are hearing today. Usually it is the glory of war that the poets sing, while the trumpets are sounding and the cannon are booming; but to-day it is the terror, the sorrow, the blight, the brutishness, the misery of it all that is stirring men's hearts, and kindling their imagination.

"When I read in the paper," says John Galsworthy, "of some glorious charge and the great slaughter of the enemy I feel a thrill through every fiber. It is grand, it is splendid! I take a deep breath of joy, almost of rapture. Grand, splendid! That there should be lying with their faces haggard to the stars, hundreds, thousands of men like myself, better men than myself! Hundreds, thousands who loved life as much as I, felt pain as much as I; whose women loved them as much as mine

love me! Grand, splendid! That the blood should be oozing from them into grass that once smelled as sweet to them as it does to me. That their eyes, which delighted in sunlight and beauty as much as mine should be glazing fast with death; their mouths that mothers and wives and children are aching to kiss again should be twisted into gaps of horror. Grand, splendid! That other men, no more savage than myself, should have strewn them there. Grand, splendid! That in thousands of far-off houses women, children and old men will soon be quivering with anguished memories of those lying there dead.

"I thank you, gentle pressmen, romancers, historians—you have given me a noble thrill in recounting these glories of war."

The moving pictures, too, will be helping millions to realize something of what war means. The cartoonists are getting in their work. Yes, the world is being made to see, in these days, as never before, the background of war's glories. And of course that background is tenfold blacker than it ever was before. Hitherto it has been only the heroism, the nobility, the romance which has been shown; that is all there, and it is not to be disparaged; but the black side of it—the awful reality behind it all—that has been, for the greater part, kept out of sight, and that is an awful wrong. We must know the truth of things, and the truth of things is coming to light in this war as never before. That is why the whole world is going to look at war, before this war is over, with a horror and loathing which it never knew before.

And it is not only the preachers and the poets and the artists and the philanthropists who are learning to look at the truth and reality of it, but those millions of men who have been marching over these bloody fields and lying in these trenches, when they are home again are very apt to want to know what is the good of it all. They have seen the horror of it, and have borne the brunt of it, bravely, no doubt; but they will be asking one another, as men never before have asked one another, "What is the good of it all? What have we, what has our country gained by it? How much better off are we for having lost from our side so many hundreds of thousands of our comrades and our countrymen, for having put to death so many hundred thousands of our brothers of other lands whose right to life was just as good as ours? They were not our enemies, and we were not theirs. What right had we to kill them? If any great gain to liberty were coming out of all this we might be content, but where is the gain? We want to be shown. And we are going to know before we go out again on any such business why we are going."

I think that there is likely to be, when these armies are disbanded, a good deal of such talk as this in the humble homes of the European continent, from which have been drawn the millions who have made this war possible.

And not in the humble homes alone. Multitudes of men and women, in all the walks of life, whose livelihood has been

taken away, whose hearthstones have been broken, whose hearts have been torn with anguish, will be asking the same questions: "What is the good of it all? What does it mean? Why, in the name of all that is sacred, all that is human, why all this waste of human life, of all the best gains of human knowledge and skill and loving thought, and loving labor? Why? Why? Why? This is a reasonable world and we are reasonable beings. We want to know the reason of this war? Every one of these nations insists, protests, asseverates, that it has been fighting a defensive warfare. That to begin with, is the acme of unreason; the whole business is founded on unreason. Each nation imputes to the others its own suspicions and fears and enmities, and proceeds to prepare for war, and to make war on that basis. That is the fundamental principle on which, hitherto, international relations have been governed. The underlying assumption is that nations are natural enemies. Every nation assumes that every other nation is not only a possible but a probable foe; and, therefore, the rulers of every nation proceed to cultivate the suspicions and the fears and the enmities of their own people toward other nations, and to build up armaments out of which nothing but war can come. That is the genesis of war—of this war, of most wars. The mainspring of war is the fundamental assumption that nations are natural enemies. It is time that this assumption were challenged and expelled from the human mind. It is the central delusion of humanity. It is the cornerstone of the kingdom of hell. Nations are not natural enemies; they are natural allies, neighbors, co-operators. Each prospers best by the friendliest relation with all the rest; each is vitally interested in the welfare of every other. This is the fact, the eternal, immutable, adamantine fact against which rulers in their stupidity and madness have forever been knocking out of their own brains, and the time has come for this idiosyncrasy to cease. We want no peace made on any such basis. Such peace is no peace. We want no peace which merely undertakes to equalize enmities, and to put the nation in the best possible fighting position for the next outbreak of insanity. We want a peace which shall rest on the assumption that nations are friends, not enemies; a peace which shall seek to heal, instead of rending; a peace whose avowed motive and purpose it shall be to preserve and perpetuate peace, and to make war impossible.

"Therefore, we want a league—a solemn league and covenant, in which all the peoples shall be represented, whose business it shall be to make and keep the peace. By this league all armaments must be commanded, save those needed by each nation to keep the peace within its own borders; by this league all international relations must be controlled. There must be no triple alliances nor triple ententes—no combinations offensive or defensive of some nations against others, never, never more! That would be treason against the peace of the world. We must have a peace which is based on the fact of brotherhood; in which each nation joyfully confesses its friendship for all the rest. This means, of course that our armaments shall be dismantled,

or reduced to an international police, and that the great resources of the people now wasted in war shall be devoted to the arts of peace.

"This is what we, the people demand, we have the power to enforce our demand and we shall enforce it, and it will be a dangerous thing for the men in the high places to shut their ears against it."

Some such voices the men in the high places are sure to hear, if they have ears to hear. Will they listen? I am inclined to believe that they will have to listen. There will be those among them to whom these admonitions will be audible, and to whom they will have an ominous sound. And when they sit down around the council boards, and gather together the bills payable for this banquet of blood, and confront the awful waste of their productive energies which they have suffered, and the wrecks awaiting repairs, and the crushing burdens which have been added to the national debts under which they were already staggering, it will be a time for some very sober reflections.

I can see some grave statesman with blanched cheek and furrowed brow standing up among them and speaking after this manner:

"The hour is critical; let us not conceal it from ourselves. We are at the parting of the ways. Whither one path leads, we know. We have followed its bloody trail for centuries, and the end is in plain sight. It leads to national ruin. The people were taxed, before the war, in building up armaments until the exaction brought blood; now the debt is doubled. Will they carry it? I do not know.

"But if these nations keep on in the path they have been travelling, the burden will have to be constantly and indefinitely increased. Not one of them will dare to stop with its present armaments; each one must have more ships, more big guns, more fortresses, more soldiers. War is the horse-leech that cries, Give! Give! Do you think that these patient multitudes are going to endure this? I tell you that they will not. There will be labor strikes, insurrections, revolutions; your bonds will be dishonored, your thrones will totter, your governments will go down in wreck and ruin.

"Such is the road on which you have been travelling, and such is the end thereof. What is the good of it all? What shall it profit a nation if it gain the whole world and lose itself? Rome got the whole world once, and what became of Rome? You think you have made some gains out of this war, but what are they worth compared with your losses? Are they any compensation for the misery you have inflicted, for the havoc you have wrought, for the desolations you have made, for the dulling of the finer intellects of your people, for the millstone you have bound upon the neck of the nation? Look behind you! Look ahead! Do you dare to go on?

"I tell you that the time has come for the earth to rid herself of this madness. We are at the parting of the ways. The

path of peace lies open before us. It is our only escape from doom.

"What is the first step in the way of safety? It is the simple recognition of the truth that nations are not natural enemies; that they are natural friends. It is to trample under our feet, as the spawn of hell, the doctrine on which international relations have so long been grounded, the doctrine so explicitly stated by one whose teachings are in good part the inspiration of this war, that, *'It is a persistent struggle for possession, power and sovereignty which primarily governs the relations of one nation to another, and right is respected only so far as it is compatible with advantage.'* That doctrine will keep the world at war until the nations have devoured one another, until all that the world has won out of primeval barbarism has been blotted out. It is the essence of all falsehood; it is blasphemy against the Holy Spirit of humanity.

"The nations are not enemies. What quarrel have the people of France, of Germany, of Austria, of England, of Russia, one with another? They are not enemies. They are learning to work together for the common welfare. They are exchanging their products, sharing their traditions, mingling their lives. We have enticed them into war by making them believe that the other nations were conspiring against them, to oppress and enslave them. It was a lie, and many of them know it now, more will know it before long. We are not going to fool them much longer. They are coming to understand that people ought to be friends; that their worst enemies are those who set them to fighting each other. Woe to us, the men in high places, if we are found standing under that gathering storm of the people's wrath.

"We have got to clear our heads of this age-long insanity and confess the truth that God has made of one blood all peoples that dwell upon the earth to live together as brothers, to study the things that make for peace and the things whereby they may edify one another; to prepare the ways of peace, to form the compacts that shall ensure peace; to put away from us the weapons of war, and the suspicions and fears and enmities that breed war; to usher in the dawn of that day so long expected, when nations shall learn war no more."

I think that when, after this carnage is checked, the representatives of the nations shall assemble to consider what must be done, voices will be heard speaking in this tenor, and that they will be commanding voices, convincing voices, and it will be necessary to heed them. And when the truth which they utter shall be accepted, then and not till then shall we see the end of war.

My belief that it will be accepted and that ere long rests on my immovable conviction that light is safer than darkness, that

love is better than hate, that reason is clearer than unreason, and that God is stronger than the devil. If these things are so then the world must turn before long from the ways of war into the paths of peace, and I do not think it a visionary hope that even this stupid, blundering, blind old world will get its eyes open to see, before it goes much further on its road, that the turning point has come.

## Get a New Idea

---

*From that time Jesus began to preach and to say, Repent ye, for the Kingdom of heaven is at hand.*—MATT. IV: 17.

In the preceding chapter we read of the first appearance of John the Baptist, known as the forerunner of the Christ,—and his first words were, “Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.” Thus it appears that the Baptist and the Christ began their ministry with the same message, and began that message with the same word, “Repent ye.”

The meaning of the word they used is hardly conveyed by the word, Repent. That suggests to us mainly a penitential mood—regret and sorrow for misdoing. The Greek word means much more. It suggests a response which is more definite and more intellectual. “*Change your minds*,” is the exact translation. “*Get a new idea*!” is the real meaning. It is not primarily a call to penitence, though penitence may be involved in the process. The change of mind may show us that we have been doing wrong, and make us sorry for what we have been doing. But the first thing which this call requires of us is an intellectual change. It is an admonition to put away the thought which now occupies your mind and substitute for it another and more appropriate thought.

When we speak of changing our minds we do not mean that we exchange our present mental apparatus for some other, but that we change the operation of our mental powers; that we arrest the processes which are now going on and set our minds at work in some other way.

Changing our mind is apt also to suggest the existence of a mental operation which has been continuous and more or less habitual, but which has been interrupted, and something different has been substituted for it. When I say that I have changed my mind about going to Chicago, you understand that I have had a plan to go, but have given it up. But the plan was the product of an idea, and was abandoned because some other idea had taken possession of my mind. When I say that I have changed my mind about studying law, you understand that I had been entertaining that purpose and have abandoned it. But it must have been because I had got a new idea of what was best for me.

Some people assume and seem to teach that feeling or emotion is the basis of all action, but, in all practical matters that is rather absurd. I couldn't have any sane *feeling* about going to Chicago or not going, unless I had an *idea* or ideas in my mind of what it meant to go to Chicago and what was to be gained or

lost by going; and I could not have any rational feeling about studying law unless I had some ideas about the study of law, and of my adaptation to the business.

These very elementary illustrations enable us to understand the force of the injunction, "Change your minds." It strikes at the center of our moral life; it uncovers the source of character. For, as Professor Ross says: "On the whole the virtues grow on an intellectual stalk. Right conduct is *thought-out* conduct. *Conscience is a way of thinking things.*"

It is equally true that most of our vices grow on an intellectual stalk. Wrong conduct is, to a very large extent, the product of wrong ideas. Most of the men and women who are living unsocial and injurious lives are doing so because they have false or defective ideas of the good of life.

This principle can be seen working itself out sometimes on a tremendous scale, on the scale of a nation. You can see a nation—more than one nation, perhaps—getting an exaggerated idea of its own importance, and its relation to other nations, and filling the earth with slaughter in its attempt to realize its ideas. War, as an institution, is the simple and inevitable result of the old idea that nations are natural enemies. We shall never get rid of it until rulers and people change their minds about this, and get the new idea that nations can be and must be friends.

You can see, then, that this injunction may have profound meaning and radical consequences. It is not a mere commonplace of conduct, it is in the primary obligation of life. There is none of us who does not need to pay heed to it, though to some it has wider application than to others. If a prophet like John or a Teacher like Jesus should stand in this place, this morning, saying: "Change your minds, for the kingdom of heaven is here," most of you would be constrained to do some sharp and serious thinking, and I have no doubt you would quickly discover some radical need of such changes.

But let us try, at first, to see what these words must have meant to the people who first listened to them. The small word "for" in the text has a very large meaning. "Change your minds, *for* the kingdom of heaven is here." That is the force of it. The kingdom of heaven was what these people had been thinking of, praying for, waiting for, for many centuries. What they meant by it was the restoration of their nation under divine leadership to independence and power, and the re-establishment of order and justice and prosperity within her borders. The more enlightened and spiritually minded among them had come to see that such a result could only be attained through national righteousness, and they were hoping that the nations round about would share in the welfare that was coming to them; but all was connected with their nationality; the kingdom of heaven was to be set up here on these plains of Palestine, and it was to be essentially a political institution; out of Zion was to go forth the law to the other nations and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. That great rehabilitation of the Jewish nationality



was the thing they were looking for, but surely it was nowhere in sight. Their land was a Roman province, a Roman procurator sat in the palace on the holy hill of Zion, Roman legionaries patrolled their streets, there was no sign of any recovery of their power. The kingdom of heaven for which they were looking was apparently far in the future.

And now comes a messenger who bids them change their minds, for the Kingdom of heaven is here. "What can that mean? The Kingdom of heaven here, with the Roman eagles perching on the gates of Jerusalem, and the Roman legions quartered in every city? It will require some radical changes of mind before we can realize that." So they might have answered. And, indeed, this was exactly what was meant by the call of the Master. The truth which He sought to reveal to them was simply this, that the Kingdom of heaven is, primarily, not a geographical or a political fact but a spiritual fact, an ethical fact, a social fact; that its seat is in the inward parts; that it rules first our thoughts, our wishes, our purposes; that its law is not enforced by swords and spears.

The fundamental fact of the Kingdom of heaven is that it is the Kingdom of a Father, ruled by one who desires to be known as the Father of all men; that all men, therefore, are brothers. The fundamental law of this Kingdom is good will to all men, friendship for all men. Its obligation is summed up in the words, thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. And your neighbor is any human being, of whatever tribe or clan or color, to whom you may be of service. He may be a Philistine or a Moabite or an Amalekite, he may be a hated Samaritan, he may be a Roman centurion—anybody to whom you may have an opportunity of doing a good turn—he is your neighbor, he is your brother.

This is the law of the Kingdom of heaven. And the Kingdom is here. For the King is here, always here. You have no need to seek Him behind palace gates; enter your own cabin and shut the door and He is there; nay, at any moment, in the loneliest desert or on the most crowded thoroughfare, you have only to breathe a wish and He is with you, "closer than breathing and nearer than hands or feet." And where the King is there the Kingdom must be. Whoever in heart and life seeks and purposes to obey the law of the Kingdom, is a citizen of the Kingdom, and therefore the Kingdom is not a distant fact or a future fact but a present fact.

Such was the mighty truth conveyed in this, which is, so far as we know, the first sentence that fell from the lips of the Founder of Christianity—His first utterance, as a public teacher. It condenses the message of His Gospel. And we can readily understand what a radical change must have been required in the minds of those who should intelligently accept it. There were, no doubt, some of those who first listened to it who had had some glimpses of the spiritual nature of the Kingdom, but to most of them it must have been a startling

novelty. And the statement that the Kingdom was already present was a new idea, the newest and perhaps the most difficult to entertain that had ever knocked at the doors of their intelligence. To take it in and make it at home in their customary thinking would be a revolutionary procedure.

"God the universal Father, to whom all nations and tribes are equally dear"—could they find room in their thought for that idea? Oh no. To be sure they had come to the belief that there was but one God, and that all these Gentiles must owe their existence to Him. He was their Creator, and in that sense their Father; they had got as far as that; but that He could have any real paternal relations with any but the Jews they could not for one moment believe. The only way in which God could ever become a real Father to any Gentile was by his first becoming a Jew; then he would be an adopted child and would receive a Father's love and care—only then!

And brothers—what? These Syrians on the north, these Egyptians and Ethiopians on the south, these Phoenicians, these Romans—all these uncircumcised hordes—brothers? It is impossible! Nay, it is the very essence of irreligion to think of such a thing.

Some such response must have been made by most of those who heard these first sermons of Jesus and understood what they meant. The change in their minds which the conception required was too radical for them. They couldn't get the new idea. It was too large for their minds.

I wonder how many even of those who became His disciples and attached themselves to Him ever got the new idea. Some parts of it they did get, I am sure. They got the idea that God was *their* Father, and thus they came into filial relations with Him. They got the idea that He was their Friend, and they learned to trust Him and found comfort and strength in that new and dear personal fellowship with Him into which Jesus led them. That was a great gain for them; religion had a new meaning to them, and some of them spent their lives in trying to bring men into the same blessed personal experience.

But very few of them, I think, ever got hold of the new and great idea that God is the Father of all men, and that therefore all men are brothers. For when Jesus passed beyond their sight and these apostles who were scattered abroad by the persecutions in Jerusalem went everywhere preaching the word, did they begin to preach this gospel of the Kingdom—this doctrine that God is the universal Father, and that all men are brothers? By no means. They wanted to convert all men to Christianity, of course; but they insisted that the Gentiles must first be converted to Judaism before they could be Christians. They did not propose to admit to their fellowship any but native or naturalized Jews. This was true of the men who had been the companions of Jesus in all His ministry. So imperfectly had they grasped the central truth of Christ's Gospel. So utterly had they failed to get the great new idea which Jesus came to bring to men! It was not until Paul, who was born

outside of Palestine, who never knew Christ, and who had gained much of his education in a Greek city, had got hold of the message of Jesus that the real meaning of it was enforced, and the doctrine of the Kingdom was widened enough to let the Gentiles directly into the Church without forcing them to go through the portals of Judaism. That was what Paul did for the Church, and it was much—it was a great gift; rightly has it been said that he was the greatest reformer that the Church has ever known. Through this partial recovery of the meaning of Jesus it has been possible for the Church to enter all countries and tribes and to make converts in them all. And of course it has been an article of faith that men of all nations and tongues, when converted and baptized, brought together in the Church, were brothers.

But this, after all, is but a small part of what Jesus meant by the Gospel of the Kingdom. His Gospel was that all men *are* brothers, not may be; converted or unconverted, baptized or unbaptized, inside your national boundaries or outside of them; whether they speak your language or a language you cannot understand; whether they are of your color or some other color—all are the children of one Father, and all are brothers. That truth has never yet been heartily believed or consistently taught by the organizations that claim to be Christian churches. If anything is central in Christianity this is. Has it been made central in the teaching of Christianity during the nineteen centuries of its history? Not by any means. Look at the historic creeds. They are supposed to express the truths which are central and essential. What have they to say about the universal Fatherhood of God and the universal brotherhood of man? Not much. The Apostles' Creed and the Nicene Creed both confess faith in "God the Father Almighty," *maker* of heaven and earth; His creatorship they acknowledge, but they have no hint of His universal paternal relation, and not a suggestion of the brotherhood of all His children. Is there anything about these central truths of Fatherhood and Brotherhood in the thirty-nine articles of the Anglican Church? Not a word. Is there any clear statement of them in the Westminster Confession of the Presbyterian Church, or the Savoy Confession of the Congregationalists? No. These ancient symbols are concerned about other things. They could not emphasize this doctrine of the Universal Fatherhood, for by their doctrine of the fall of man the fact of fatherhood was canceled; all men by the sin of Adam had become alienated from God and were under His wrath and curse; He was their Creator and they were His creatures, but there could be no paternal or filial relations between them until they were regenerated. They had to be adopted, before they could be His children. How could this central truth of the Gospel of the Kingdom be preached or taught by those who consistently held such beliefs? They could not be, and they have not been. The preachers, the great evangelists have not been proclaiming, through these nineteen centuries, the doctrines of the universal

Fatherhood of God and the universal Brotherhood of man. That has not been their message. They have been saying that God was willing to be the Father of those who would repent and believe; that only those could claim His Fatherhood. To those within the Church and to all the regenerate, within or without the Church He was a Father—the rest were aliens to His Kingdom, disinherited children with no claim upon His mercy.

Of course there have always been those who, in spite of the dogmas, believed in the Fatherhood. Parents have taught their unconverted children to say the Lord's Prayer, though, logically, they had no right to say it. How could they speak of God as their Father when they knew that He had repudiated the fatherly relation? But multitudes have clung to the fact, ignoring the theory, and so the truth of the Fatherhood has always had a home in the hearts of men. It was very inconsistent in them, no doubt; but I say again, Bless God for the inconsistencies of the Christian faith! Are we not saved, pretty largely, by our inconsistencies? Was not that what Tennyson meant when he said,

"There lives more faith in honest doubt,  
Believe me, than in half the creeds."

I am sure that millions and millions of our fellow men have been made better men by believing for themselves and for their children in the Fatherhood in which, by their creeds, they had no right to believe, than they would have been if they had followed their logic to its bitter conclusion.

But, as a rule, through the Christian centuries, the doctrine preached and taught has not been the doctrine of the universal Fatherhood of God. Some few have preached it, in all the ages, and, during the last hundred years a steadily growing number have got firm hold of it and have declared it with conviction and passion. But these have generally been regarded as heretics, and the Gospel of the Kingdom as Jesus preached it has not, by the generality of preachers, been proclaimed as the central message of the Christian Church. Indeed it is quite the custom of those who are regarded as the great expounders of what is known as "the good old Gospel" to hold this Gospel of the Kingdom up to scorn, to denounce it as infidelity; and some of you have heard, here in Columbus, one who is acclaimed as the greatest evangelist since the day of Pentecost, declaring in these words that "the doctrine of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man is the worst rot that was ever dug out of hell and that every man who preaches it is a liar." Not many preachers hate the doctrine like that, but there are many who have no use for it.

Instead of being told that the Kingdom is here, we have been hearing that it is coming by and by, in the millennium, perhaps a thousand years from now. Instead of learning that God is the Father of all men, we have been taught that He is now only the ruler and judge and punisher of the vast mass of mankind, that He is the Father only of the converted people.

Instead of coming to think that all men are brothers and must behave brotherly we have been instructed that all men are by nature enemies and haters of one another; that as members of a depraved race nothing else can be expected of them; that those who are shut out from the benefits of the divine Fatherhood cannot, of course, be required to cultivate the virtues of the human brotherhood; and that, therefore, outside of the society of the regenerate, the world may be expected to be a scene of strife and conflict.

"According to your faith be it unto you"—that is the law. If that is the best your religion has to offer men, you will know what to look for. They will certainly be no better than their religious theory requires them to be. If men are taught to expect that their neighbors will all be as selfish and greedy as they dare to be, all will be suspecting one another, watching against one another, getting ready to take advantage of one another when the opportunity comes. Of course they soon find out that such conditions bring pandemonium in any human society and they are forced, in self-defense, to cultivate in their own neighborhoods relations of good will and confidence—forced to exercise virtues of which by their theology they are incapable. Once more they are saved by their inconsistencies.

But enough of the poison of the bad doctrine is still left in them to justify no end of selfishnesses and malignities, and to keep the human race boiling with strife and conflict. This is what the world has been taught to expect of itself, and the world sees to it that the expectation is not wholly disappointed.

Especially does this malign expectation find full room to work itself out in what Bernhardt calls the "extra-social struggle," when international policies are being shaped. Here the theory that men are by nature antagonists rather than associates, and haters rather than lovers is given free course. Thus theology warrants the rulers of all states in believing that the people of all other states are their enemies. This is the logical and inevitable deduction from the doctrine of human depravity. Fraternity is unnatural to unconverted men, and most of the inhabitants of all these states are unconverted. Their natural relation to each other is therefore that of ill-will. Each may be expected to attack and overpower the others whenever it believes itself able to do so. That is what is to be predicated of unconverted human nature. So the theologians say, and the rulers, of course, get their notions about human nature largely from the theologians. So every nation is watching against every other nation, cultivating in its own heart the resentments which spring from its suspicions, building the armaments by which it makes ready for the war in which all these enmities must culminate.

Is it not pitiful, is it not tragical that the Church which bears the name of Jesus Christ should have produced a theory of human nature which lends itself to such uses as that?

Was this what Jesus meant when he bade them change their minds because the Kingdom of heaven had come? Was

this the new idea which He wanted them to get? No; they had this idea already. What He wanted them to believe was that God was the Father of all men, and that all men were brothers. It would have required a great change in their minds to grasp this idea, no doubt; but this was the call He made upon them. I do not suppose that He expected the whole world to grasp it at once, but I think that He hoped that a few would get the new idea and would cling to it, and lift it up and keep it alive and live by it, and make the world believe in it.

I do not think that He is disappointed today. For a few have always believed in it and kept it alive; and more people believe in it today—many more than ever before in all the centuries. But how long it has taken the world to get this simple idea, that we all have one Father, and that we are all brothers. Dimly, dimly it has been shining through all these centuries; and now and then it has flamed out in a great sermon or a great picture or a great poem that sent a thrill through the heart of humanity; but still its brightness has been veiled, and its music has been drowned in the clamor of the world's strife, so that all through these Christian centuries men—these brothers!—have been enslaving and exploiting one another in field and mine and factory; and sharpening swords, and forging cannon and building battleships and mixing hellish explosives to kill one another—these Christian brothers! these Christian brothers! How feebly, how feebly they have grasped the new idea!

Suppose that all those who have called themselves Christians had really grasped the new idea. Suppose that the theologians had seized it, and made it the center and soul of all their teaching—that one is our Father—the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, whose life and death reveals Him; and that we are all brothers—men of every hue, of every clime, of every tongue—all brothers; no foreigners, no strangers, no foes—all brothers; and that the Kingdom of heaven is here, the Kingdom of friendship and good will—here, to possess the earth and to gather into itself all nations and tribes and continents and islands; suppose they had emblazoned this on their banners and carved it upon their altars, and made it the theme of their anthems, and organized their whole Church life around it; and suppose that the whole Church had concentrated its energies on making these truths of Fatherhood and brotherhood vital and effective; insisting that no man could be a Christian who doubted them; that the one deadly infidelity was the denial of them; suppose that the nineteen Christian centuries had been devoted to the enforcement of these central truths of Christianity, should we not be living in a very different world from that in which we are living today? In a world in which these truths had been made real and vital by the passionate conviction and the heroic and devoted living of hundreds of millions of Christian confessors, could any such things be taking place as those which we are witnessing today?

It is not too late, I trust, for Christendom to get the new idea—the *new idea* which Jesus besought it to accept nineteen

centuries ago—and to make it central and commanding in the life of the world. That it should be, to so many, a new idea today, is an astounding fact. But it is an idea, thank God, that can never grow old, any more than sunlight and rain or seed-time and harvest can go out of fashion. If we have spent a good many generations in planting chaff or nettle seed, that is no reason why we should not today accept the good seed and sow it beside all waters. The kindly earth will nourish it and the sunshine and the rain will ripen it, and we may see a harvest growing which shall make glad the heart of man.

Surely the old world is calling, with all its voices of horror and woe and agony, for some new idea on which to rebuild its shattered civilization. The old foundations of rivalry and strife, of distrust and antipathy on which it has been seeking to rest its structures of art and industry are crumbling; some new principle must be discovered on which to found human relations. Is not the first word that Jesus spoke the word that the world needs now to hear? Is anything more needed to make an end of this horror and to put this madness out of the world, than that the rulers and the peoples should change their minds about nations being naturally hostile, and should get the new idea that nations are naturally friendly, since all the people of all the nations have one Father and all are of one family? If that is the fact then the first thing they have to do is to come together and make a compact which shall recognize and express that fact.

Is it not an impressive circumstance that the thought of the whole world seems to be moving steadily and strongly in this direction? I have read a good many discussions of what is to come after the war, and the way out, and a great consensus of opinion seems to be gathering that there can be no way out except some kind of league of peace, which shall pave the way for the parliament of man, the federation of the world. What would have been sneered at six months ago, by the great majority, as utterly Utopian, begins to be recognized by a good share of the people who think, as the only possible cure for the world's woe.

When the day comes, as come it must ere long, that the great ones of the earth get ready to make the principle of brotherhood the corner-stone of a universal commonwealth, it will perhaps be plain to all the world that Christianity is not a failure. And it may perhaps be more evident by that time that the Church which bears the name of Jesus Christ can find no better foundation for its life and teaching than the Gospel of the Kingdom.

Dec. 27, 1914.

# The Church and Peace

---

*Men and brethren, what shall we do?—ACTS II: 37.*

The modern peace movement is less than a hundred years old. There have been advocates of peace, arguments for peace in all the centuries and much of their inspiration has come from the teachings of Jesus and from the New Testament. But it remains a shameful fact, not only that organized Christianity has never in any consistent and concerted way arrayed itself against war, but that no organized effort was made outside the Church to put an end to war until the beginning of the nineteenth century. For eighteen centuries the Church which bears the name of Jesus Christ has been either tacitly assenting to war, or making apology for it, or taking part in it. It has not so instructed and influenced the public opinion of the Christian nations that they have seriously sought for some method of settling international difficulties without fighting. It is only within the last hundred years that the Christian people of the various Christian nations have earnestly turned their attention to this problem of peace.

That the life and teachings of Jesus Christ as contained in the New Testament have had much to do in turning their thought in this direction cannot be doubted. This is one of the sources from which the modern peace movement has arisen. But it is not the only source.

"The Modern Peace Movement," says Dr. Gilbert, "is a deep and powerful river formed by the union of a number of differing streams. Only one of these confluent tributaries has its immediate origin in the Gospel. Others proceed from springs unlike that and also more or less unlike each other."

The Modern Peace Government finds its spring in part in economic facts and forces. The vast improvement in the means of intercommunication, the diversification of industries and the facilitation of exchanges have brought all nations into profitable commercial intercourse; we are exchanging, with great advantage, the products of our enterprises; we are becoming interdependent, and the reason why these relations should be free and uninterrupted are numerous and strong. War, in any part of the world, checks or embarrasses these commercial movements, and such a war as the present not only paralyzes the industries of the people taking part in it but causes the greatest inconvenience and loss to all the other civilized nations. There are very powerful business reasons, therefore, why the world should put an end to war. Nor can these be dismissed as merely sordid and materialistic considerations. For the losses and sufferings which even the neutral nations must suffer in a great war, are borne not only by the traders,



they fall heavily on multitudes of laborers and employes. The closing of foreign markets to our products takes the bread out of the mouths of our own working people. There are a good many little children in Columbus who have had less than they needed to eat today because of what is going on in France and Poland.

These economic considerations are coming to have increasing weight in determining questions of peace or war, and they ought to have. The frightful expensiveness of war is a fact which must be weighed. The applications of modern science to the arts of destruction not only enormously enhance the cost of the preparations for war, but they render war proportionately more destructive, both of life and of property. It is this terrific cost of modern war which M. de Bloch figured out so appallingly in his book on War, the reading of which it is said, induced the Czar to call the first Peace Conference.

The national debts, mostly due to war, have been mounting higher and higher year after year, until they have become an almost intolerable load upon our industries. More than two-thirds of all the money raised by the United States Government, in direct and indirect taxation, goes for past or future wars. This war, of course, will add immensely to the debts of all the European countries—how much no man can tell, and the taxes will be a crushing burden upon all classes, but especially upon the wage-workers. Well may the people of all the nations demand to be shown what benefit they are receiving from all this enormous outlay of life and treasure.

Another of the springs of the Peace Movement is in the humanitarian sentiment which has grown so wonderfully during the last century. The horror of war, the suffering which it brings, the butchery and carnage, the maiming of so many lives, the desolation and poverty of so many households—all these are being realized, as never before, by the masses of the people, and they cause a revolt against war which is wide-spread and passionate.

And the moral revolt is no less significant. "War," says Dr. Gilbert, "is cruel and pitiless. The joy of the present and hope of the future disappear in its bloody maw. The wheels of progress are blocked, sometimes for generations. War piles up debts for the children and grandchildren of those who fall on the field. War exalts types of character which are relatively low, qualities especially suited to the work of destruction. Wars produce dictators and despots, clever maneuverers of armies and bold fighters—Joshuas and Davids, it may be, but oftener a Periander, a Clovis, a Richard III, a John, a Tilly, an Alva—but they do not produce great educators and inventors, great philanthropists and artists, great poets and prophets, or simply plain, good men."\*

All these reasons for peace—the economic reasons, the humanitarian reasons, the moral reasons—may be regarded as

---

\*The Bible and Universal Peace, p. 213.

distinct from the influences which have been set in motion by the Church. At least it is true that there are many earnest advocates of peace who are not in the churches, and not in close sympathy with them, to whom these considerations most strongly appeal. It might be plausibly urged that these humanitarians and these moralists have gained the largest part of their inspiration from the New Testament, but that point may be waived. It is sufficient to recognize the fact that strong influences are at work in behalf of peace which are not distinctly and consciously religious influences. The churches must recognize these and use them, to the fullest extent. The economic forces and the humanitarian forces and the moral forces are all parts of the Kingdom of God, and it is the business of the Church to discern and promote every interest of that Kingdom.

The churches are not, then, called to monopolize the influences which make for peace nor to assume an exclusive leadership of the modern peace movement. But the Church of Jesus Christ certainly has a responsibility in this matter which she cannot disregard. That the Kingdom which Jesus Christ meant to establish in the world is a Kingdom of peace cannot be disputed. That a large part of the business of the Church which claims to represent Him must be the prevention of war and the promotion of peace is equally clear. That organized Christianity has utterly failed in this task is quite too plain. That the present horrible conditions are largely due to this failure must be sorrowfully confessed. And therefore the present war is at once such an arraignment of the Church for its dereliction, and such a trumpet call to bestir itself and grapple with the neglected duty as the Church has never before heard in all its history. If this war does not convict the Church of sin, and "stab its spirit broad awake," it is doubtful whether anything will ever do it. And it would seem as though this sense of shame and humiliation, this passionate desire to make amends for past neglect should stir organized Christendom to its depths, and we should hear in every assembly of disciples the cry that was heard at Pentecost, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?"

The first thing to do is to recognize not only the responsibility of the Church but its power to meet its obligation. The Church can put an end to war, whenever it addresses itself seriously to that task. Within ten years the Christian Church could make any general or serious war a moral impossibility. The words that follow, by Dr. Charles Holley Gilbert, do not overstate the truth concerning the Church:

"It holds in Christendom the balance of power between war and peace. One may safely go further, and say that the clergy hold the balance of power. For, consider their influence a moment. The clergy of the United States number approximately 175,000, and there are, perhaps, about three times as many in Europe, exclusive of Russia, 700,000 in all.\* These

---

\* But why "exclusive of Russia"? Are not the clergy of the Greek Church equally under obligation to preach peace?

men as a class have that authority which flows from a thorough education, they have the prestige of representing a religion that has surpassed all others in its power to uplift humanity, and they have the unique personal influence that springs from a ministry to men in the vital matters of the soul and in the most sacred events of the outward life. These 700,000 Christian ministers have an opportunity to determine the ideals of perhaps twenty millions of boys and girls whom they have consecrated to the God of peace in baptism.

"Moreover, this great host of ministers who are pledged to preach the Gospel would have, in the advocacy of peace, almost the unanimous support of the women of the Church, probably not less than fifty millions, as well as the support of a majority of those women of Christian lands who are not in the Church, and they would also be upheld by a number of men within the Church, which, if not as large as the number of women, would, nevertheless, be many times as large as the army of Xerxes, while a multitude of men outside the Church are ready for a leadership of peace.

"Upon these 700,000 ministers of the Gospel rests a peculiarly solemn responsibility for the peace of the world. They are, of all men, best acquainted with the teaching of Jesus, and it is their sole business in life to enforce that teaching. Granted that they do not agree on the question whether the Bible ever sanctions war, they must agree, if they read the Bible intelligently and without the fear of man, that Jesus laid supreme emphasis on the attainment of qualities of character which render war increasingly impossible, and they must agree that the spirit of Jesus would try every suggestion of brotherly love before it would ever consider a resort to the dread arbitrament of war."\*

The force is in the field. There is no need of any additional organization, no funds are called for; it is only necessary that these ministers of the Gospel of peace should stand in the places where they are called to stand and preach the word they have been bidden to preach. They can very well afford to leave on one side a good many of the topics which have hitherto occupied most of their thought, until they have given the Gospel of the Kingdom the place that belongs to it—until they have made men believe that the Kingdom of the Father is here, and that it brings the whole world into one brotherhood. Seven hundred thousand preachers with their hearts on fire with this truth, would create an atmosphere in which war would not live very long.

This is the great thing to do, the first thing to do. To open the minds of men to this central truth of the unity of human-kind—that there is but one Father, and that we are all brothers, this is the one essential thing in the preparation for universal peace. It is not by legal machinery, it is not by political methods that this great good will be secured. Something

---

\*The Bible and Universal Peace, pp. 203-4.

may be done, it is true, by the provision of fitting forms through which the spirit of peace may find expression. The labor of men like Grotius in framing the principles of international law is not wasted. The organization of courts of arbitration and Hague Tribunals is of great service. Such work is often derided, because it does not give in at once the entire result for which we are looking, but the derision misses its mark. It helps to guide the thoughts of men toward the good which the future will bring.

Yet the great need is not so much the machinery of peace, as the conviction of the oneness of all people, the faith in brotherhood, the spirit of brotherhood; and that is an essentially religious conviction; it springs from deeper sources than any which can be opened in our legal tribunals.

"The peace between men," says Dr. Gilbert, "which is the reflex of the brotherhood of man, is not a thing that treaties can either produce or guard. It has no need of courts of arbitration, no need of international police. Where Jesus' ideal of brotherhood is realized, there peace is indestructible. The peace of brotherhood is, in the thought of Jesus, a religious state. It is not from beneath, but from above. The sun, whose warmth produces the feeling of brotherliness and so creates peace, is the Father in heaven. From fatherliness flows brotherliness and from brotherliness peace. The guarantee of peace is as strong as the bond of faith, and the strength of faith is in proportion to its realization of the Fatherhood of God. Any community or group of communities, small or large, in which religion means simply love of God and godly love of man has peace." \*

Are we demanding too much when we demand that the church shall make religion mean this, in every community in which it is planted? And does not every man know that when religion does mean this, war will be at an end?

Wise statesmen and diplomats who have unlearned the devilish tradition of universal enmity and have got the new idea that peace is best secured, not by the alligation of hatreds, but by the commingling of interests and services, will soon be at work upon plans by which the conflicting claims of these contending peoples may be adjusted. It is impossible to predict, at this juncture, what shape the problem will assume when it is presented to that Congress of the Powers which will by and by be called to work it out. Many devices are already suggested but most of them are likely to be superannuated before the war is over. The churches ought to be able to lend valuable aid in all these negotiations. They ought to influence greatly the choice of the men by whom these negotiations will be conducted. They ought to watch, vigilantly, the selection of the representatives of the several nations in the Congress, and see that men are secured who believe in peace.

But the great business of the churches will be to awaken and diffuse the sentiment of brotherhood, the faith in peace, the hope

---

\*The Bible and Universal Peace, pp. 209-10.

for peace, the love of peace. They are the power-houses in which the current must be generated which will illuminate the discussions of the peace congress and light up the way in which the nations shall walk into the glory of the new day.

And what a glorious task it is to which the churches in this juncture are summoned. To put an end to this age long curse and misery; to roll back the tides of carnage and slaughter which have been sweeping over the centuries; to banish the shadow that has long been darkening the homes of men and lift the burden which is always crushing the toilers; to kindle in the hearts of men new hope for the coming of a brighter day; to comfort the farmer as he sows his seed with the assurance that his fields will not be rutted by cannon and ploughed by shells before the harvest is ripe; to assure the mother as she sings by the cradle that her baby boy will not be dragged forth before he is grown to be shot in the trenches; to make men see that the great expectation of a reign of good will which the world has been cherishing for centuries is not an illusion; that it is here, waiting on the threshold of the time, and that nothing is wanting to its full dominion but that men should make room in their hearts for the spirit of brotherhood;—to fill the world with this great gladness—this is the task to which the Church of this day is summoned. What a high calling it is! what a splendid mission!

And nobody will question or cavil. Her right to do this work will be joyfully conceded by all—believers or unbelievers; the blessings of all the children of men will rest upon her as she goes forth to preach to all the nations the Gospel of peace. And if, by this clear witnessing she shall succeed in awakening in the hearts of multitudes a great faith in the reality of brotherhood, and in moving them to demand that the new international bond shall be woven, not of suspicion and hate, but of trust and good will, what a glory she will win for herself; how greatly will her honor be exalted and her influence extended!

Who cannot see that the hour has come—the hour of opportunity—for the Church of the living God? The tide is flowing which taken at its flood, will restore her losses and replenish her waning strength and bear her forward to the leadership that belongs to her. And from the memories of the past, and the needs of a mighty future and a great cloud of witnesses overhead comes the arousing call: O Zion that bringest good tidings, get thee up into the high mountain; O Jerusalem that bringest good tidings, lift up thy voice with strength; lift it up, be not afraid; say unto all the nations of the earth: Behold the Kingdom is here; the Kingdom of goodwill, the Kingdom of brotherhood; mightier to rule than all your kingdoms of force and fear. The King of love your Shepherd is; Bow down before Him, ye nations, and hearken ye peoples; His way of good will is the only way; walk ye in it and be at peace!

If only the Church of God could know that her hour is come, and could grasp the occasion! If there are angels watch-

ing overhead what is going on upon the earth, I wonder what they are saying about the Christian Church and her opportunity.

For this splendid enterprise she needs no special warrant, no period of preparation, no additional equipment, no new machinery. No church needs to wait for other churches; all it has to do is to kindle in the hearts of its own members and of its neighbors the passion of universal brotherhood; to fill its own community with the sense of the reality of the Kingdom of heaven on the earth.

Any local church, any company of believers, on the avenue or in the suburb, can begin at once to tell the glad tidings. You don't require any elaborate outfit of dogma, nor any cumbersome ritual, to enable you to express it; in fact you can't express it at all unless you put those things decisively behind you. Your preaching will not be convincing unless you believe your message, and put your life into it; unless you are sure that it is the one truth that the world needs to hear. The Gospel of the Kingdom must be preached as the Crusades were preached, by men whose souls are on fire. It must be put where Jesus put it at the front of the message; it must not be the postscript of dissertations on doctrinal schemes of salvation, or sacramental substitutes for character; it must occupy the center of the stage and be made to blaze in the light of great convictions.

It will not, of course, be possible to enforce this truth of brotherhood upon the nations without discovering that it has many applications nearer home. When once we set out to make it the international bond we shall soon be made aware that its principle is no less binding on social classes and on all associations of human beings, and we shall find our Gospel of the Kingdom broadening and deepening, and our message gaining in significance. It would be strange indeed if the revisions of international morality which this war is compelling, did not react mightily upon our common social and civic morality, and show us what crying needs there are for the Christianizing of the mine and the factory and the counting room and the home, as well as the foreign office. This tremendous shaking of the foundations of our civilization will have but a lame and impotent conclusion if it does not make us see that the same bad principles, which have brought down upon us this cataclysm, are operating in all our social life with consequences less spectacular but no less malign. We shall hardly succeed in making the principle of brotherhood regnant between the nations unless at the same time we lift it up and crown it within the nations.

But all this is quite within the power of the Christian Church. The principle on which it is founded is clear as the daylight. There is no room for doubting as to what Jesus meant that His Church should be and what He meant that it should teach. If the truth which He made central has been slurred and disparaged, and if, in consequence of that infidelity, vast calamities are visited upon the earth, there is surely some reason why that truth should be recovered and made what He

meant it to be, the head-stone of the corner. This is the supreme obligation of the Christian Church at this hour.

And obligation implies ability. What we ought to do we can do. These seven hundred thousand ministers can make this truth real and regnant, if they believe it. Nay, if one-half or one-third of them would get the new idea of the Kingdom as a fire shut up in their bones and would make it the master-word of all their teaching, we should soon see conditions which would not only make war impossible, but would bring to all the disturbed and abnormal conditions of our social life health and peace.

The immediate result of such a revival of Christianity should be the creation of a sentiment which would demand a League of Peace among the nations. Yet it is probable that, to begin with, this League of Peace would be based on the assumption of possible wars; it would be intended rather as a regulation or mitigation of war than as a substitute for war; it would provide for armaments, under certain collective control, and would imply war as a possibility. That will be a vast gain, but it will not be the solution of the problem. It will be a sorry expression, after all, of the fact of brotherhood. It will leave in the future the day when nations shall learn war no more. The Church will still have a good part of its task before it. For an armed League of Peace is, when you come to think of it, an absurdity. It sounds like A Council of Liars in Aid of Truth, or A Combination of the Powers of Darkness to Spread the Light. What need of armaments has a League of Peace?

How hard it is to rid ourselves of the obsessions of militarism! Not the Germans alone but all the rest of us are militarists. It is bred in our bones. We cannot think in any other terms. We cannot conceive of any other ultimate forces but those of the material world. But when these militaristic obsessions have loosed a little more their grip upon our minds we shall be able to see that peace has no need of the implements of war; that the way to make and keep the peace is not to prepare for war, even by the most remote and indirect processes; that the only way to get rid of war, or of any other moral evil, is to assume its impossibility.

What are these armaments with which we propose to provide the League of Peace? Not offensive, of course. But if they are defensive where are the feared offenders? If all the nations engaged in the present war are brought into the League of Peace, and joined, as they would surely be, by the United States and Italy and Brazil and the Argentines and the other South American states, and China—where would be the possible enemies against whom such armaments would be needed? They are clung to, of course, because of the misgiving that the nations composing the League may fall out among themselves; because the bond of brotherhood is not trusted. Peace would not be quite secure in any family if it rested on an agreement as to the number of revolvers each brother might carry and the

length of the dirk-blades allowed to each, and was coupled with a covenant that no brother would attack any other brother without first calling a family council. The fact of brotherhood does not seem to find adequate expression in such an arrangement. When we really begin to believe in it, we shall be able to dispense with armaments. And there is not much use in talking about peace until we are ready to take the principle of brotherhood seriously. Either enmity or brotherhood must be assumed as the basis of international relations, and there can be no compromise between them. Jesus or Bernhardt—these are the alternatives before the world rulers, and the names will not be bracketed. If the world votes that the law of force is supreme, the world must take the consequences. If the world is satisfied by the experience through which it is now passing that the law of good will is a better ruling principle, then the world must adopt it whole-heartedly, and make no provision for strife to fulfil the lusts thereof. What we have been hoping for is that the world would be so sick of carnage that it would be ready to choose the way of Christ. That is a great expectation, but I, for one, am quite unable to see that anything less will be of permanent value.

In the last number of the "New Republic" I find two thoughtful articles, one of which puts aside Mr. Lowes Dickinson's plan for the restoration of peace with the remark that "he is really trusting to a spiritual conversion, to so vast an illumination of reason and good will that any plan could be worked." It adds, "He is perfectly right. If the world could feel and think as he wishes it to, any reform would be possible, but no reform would be necessary." And it intimates that all such expectations are beyond the bounds of probability.

The other writer speculates upon the possibility that men may return after the war to their old ways of thinking on the great themes of the world order, and then asks: "Is it not quite as possible that a whole new order of ideas, ideals, perhaps a religious awakening, probably a new outburst of national spirit and patriotism in all races may come?"

It is this larger possibility from which I am never able to remove my thought. I cannot believe that the world is going through this fiery baptism to emerge at the end with the same crude notions of social justice and vital religion as those which have brought these calamities upon us. So I take my stand with Mr. Dickinson and trust to a "spiritual conversion" of the ruling thought of the world, and to such an "illumination of reason and good will" as this conflagration ought to bring. And the Church of Jesus Christ is here to interpret this tragedy, and to show the people the way of life and peace.

Jan. 6, 1915.









LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 021 547 594 3